

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LEA: A bill (H. R. 10752) to authorize Federal cooperation in the acquisition of the Muir Wood Toll Road, located in Marin County, State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. WILCOX: A bill (H. R. 10753) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplemental thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAMBETH: A bill (H. R. 10754) to amend certain sections of the act entitled "An act providing for the public printing and binding and the distribution of public documents," approved January 12, 1895, as amended; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. COCHRAN: A bill (H. R. 10755) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to make and carry out agreements of indemnity to banks paying him moneys to cover checks or drafts issued by such banks payable to the United States or an agency or officer thereof which have been or may be lost or destroyed; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. HILL: A bill (H. R. 10756) to provide for the installation of an automatic machine for recording and counting votes in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida: A bill (H. R. 10757) authorizing the construction and equipment of a marine hospital in the State of Florida; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BOLAND of Pennsylvania: Resolution (H. Res. 507) requesting information relating to railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WILCOX: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 698) to permit the transportation of freight by foreign-owned vessels between the port of Fort Pierce, Fla., and the ports of Portland, Oreg., and Seattle, Wash.; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CHURCH: A bill (H. R. 10758) for the relief of Herbert Wenzel; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GINGERY: A bill (H. R. 10759) granting a pension to Maude E. Boyden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAINES: A bill (H. R. 10760) for the relief of Martha G. and Arnold E. Orner, Sally C. Guise, and the estate and minor children of Dale W. and Gladys M. Guise; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 10761) granting an increase of pension to Isabel Gammon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SACKS: A bill (H. R. 10762) for the relief of Ciro Maglione; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5236. By Mr. DEROUEN: Petition of the Louisiana Public Welfare Association, State of Louisiana, petitioning and urging the Congress of the United States to amend the Social Security Act by providing financial participation by the Social Security Board of an amount equal to 50 percent of the funds granted by States for assistance to dependent children, and to the sick, the infirm, and those otherwise physically or mentally handicapped between the ages of 16 and 64; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5237. By Mr. KENNEDY of New York: Petition of the Women's City Club, New York City, urging enactment of the wage-hour bill; to the Committee on Labor.

5238. Also, petition of the Transport Workers Union of Greater New York, N. Y., urging enactment of the wage-hour bill; to the Committee on Labor.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 26, 1938

(Legislative day of Wednesday, April 20, 1938)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday May 25, 1938, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States, submitting nominations, were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1225) to provide for insanity proceedings in the District of Columbia.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 6869. An act to regulate the occupation and practices of cosmetology, to create a District of Columbia Board of Cosmetology for the examination and licensing of persons to carry on or to teach such practices, to insure the better education of such practitioners, to provide rules regulating the proper conduct and sanitation of cosmetological establishments and schools, for the protection of the public health, and to provide penalties for violation thereof; and

H. R. 7085. An act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolutions, in which it requested the Senate:

H. R. 5696. An act to provide for the retirement of certain members of the police and fire departments of the District of Columbia, the United States Park Police force, and the White House Police force;

H. R. 7710. An act to provide shorter hours of duty for members of the fire department of the District of Columbia;

H. R. 7982. An act to regulate the manufacturing, dispensing, selling, and possession of narcotic drugs in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 9468. An act to amend the act of May 13, 1936, providing for terms of the United States district court at Wilkes-Barre, Pa.;

H. R. 9475. An act to create a commission to procure a design for a flag for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9844. An act providing for the zoning of the District of Columbia and the regulation of the location, height, bulk, and uses of buildings and other structures and of the uses of land in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9873. An act to protect trade-mark owners, producers, distributors, and the general public against injurious and uneconomic practices in the distribution of competitive commodities bearing a distinguishing trade-mark, brand, or name through the use of voluntary contracts establishing minimum resale prices and providing for refusal to sell unless such minimum resale prices are observed;

H. R. 10642. An act to amend an act entitled "District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act," approved June 12, 1934, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10643. An act to amend the act of August 9, 1935 (Public, No. 259, 74th Cong., 1st sess.);

H. R. 10673. An act to exempt the property of the Young Women's Christian Association in the District of Columbia from national and municipal taxation;

H. J. Res. 672. Joint resolution for the designation of a street to be known as "Oregon Avenue," and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 687. Joint resolution to amend title VI of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937; and

H. J. Res. 693. Joint resolution making an appropriation to aid in defraying expenses of the observance of the seventy-fifth anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Dieterich	King	Pepper
Andrews	Donahay	La Follette	Pittman
Austin	Duffy	Lee	Pope
Bankhead	Ellender	Lewis	Radcliffe
Barkley	Frazier	Lodge	Russell
Berry	George	Logan	Schwartz
Bilbo	Gerry	Louderman	Schwellenbach
Bone	Gibson	Lundeen	Sheppard
Borah	Gillette	McAdoo	Shipstead
Brown, Mich.	Glass	McCarran	Smathers
Brown, N. H.	Green	McGill	Smith
Bulkeley	Guffey	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Bulow	Hale	McNary	Townsend
Burke	Harrison	Maloney	Truman
Byrd	Hatch	Miller	Vandenberg
Byrnes	Hayden	Milton	Van Nuys
Capper	Herring	Minton	Wagner
Caraway	Hill	Murray	Walsh
Chavez	Hitchcock	Neely	Wheeler
Clark	Holt	Norris	White
Connally	Hughes	Nye	
Copeland	Johnson, Calif.	O'Mahoney	
Davis	Johnson, Colo.	Overton	

Mr. LEWIS. I announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. REAMES] are detained from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] is unavoidably detained.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are detained on important public business.

I ask that this announcement stand of record for the day.

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent because of the death of his wife.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

INTERNATIONAL EXPOSITION OF PARIS, 1937

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a detailed statement of expenditures, together with other reports, concerning the participation of the Government of the United States in the International Exposition held in Paris, France, from May 24, 1937, through November 25, 1937, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the memorial of Emma R. Frye, of Queens Village, N. Y., remonstrating against the enactment of the President's proposed recovery program, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by York Local No. 777 of the North Dakota Farmers Union, Leeds, N. Dak., protesting against the enactment of House bill 9604, the so-called May industrial mobilization bill, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution recently adopted by the Democratic State convention of South Carolina, favoring amendment of section 313, paragraph (a) of the so-called Farm Act, so that if amended the provision referred to would read as follows: "Provided, however, That to prevent in any case too sudden reduction in acreage of tobacco production on any farm, the marketing quota for flue-cured tobacco for any farm shall not be reduced to a point less than 75 percent of the 1937 production on any farm or in any State," which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. WALSH presented a petition of sundry citizens, being employees of the Springfield, Mass., post office, praying for the enactment of legislation to improve the working conditions of substitute postal employees, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were severally read twice by their titles and referred, or ordered to be placed on the calendar, as indicated below:

H. R. 9475. An act to create a commission to procure a design for a flag for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10642. An act to amend an act entitled "District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act," approved June 12, 1934, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10643. An act to amend the act of August 9, 1935 (Public, No. 259, 74th Cong., 1st sess.);

H. R. 10673. An act to exempt the property of the Young Women's Christian Association in the District of Columbia from national and municipal taxation; and

H. J. Res. 672. Joint resolution for the designation of a street to be known as "Oregon Avenue," and for other purposes; to the calendar.

H. R. 5696. An act to provide for the retirement of certain members of the police and fire departments of the District of Columbia, the United States Park Police force, and the White House Police force;

H. R. 7710. An act to provide shorter hours of duty for members of the fire department of the District of Columbia;

H. R. 7982. An act to regulate the manufacturing, dispensing, selling, and possession of narcotic drugs in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 9844. An act providing for the zoning of the District of Columbia and the regulation of the location, height, bulk, and uses of buildings and other structures and of the uses of land in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9873. An act to protect trade-mark owners, producers, distributors, and the general public against injurious and uneconomic practices in the distribution of competitive commodities bearing a distinguishing trade-mark, brand, or name through the use of voluntary contracts establishing minimum resale prices and providing for refusal to sell unless such minimum resale prices are observed; and

H. J. Res. 687. Joint resolution to amend title VI of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 9468. An act to amend the act of May 13, 1936, providing for terms of the United States district court at Wilkes-Barre, Pa.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 693. Joint resolution making an appropriation to aid in defraying expenses of the observance of the seventy-fifth anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. SHEPPARD, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

S. 3517. A bill for the relief of David B. Monroe (Rept. No. 1906);

S. 4069. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to lend certain property to the reunion committee of the United Confederate Veterans to be used at their annual encampment

to be held at Columbia, S. C., from August 30 to September 2, 1938 (Rept. No. 1908); and

S. 4088. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to grant rights-of-way for highway purposes and necessary storm sewer and drainage ditches incident thereto upon and across Kelly Field, a military reservation in the State of Texas; to authorize an appropriation for construction of the road, storm sewer, drainage ditches, and necessary fence lines (Rept. No. 1907).

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 693) making an appropriation to aid in defraying expenses of the observance of the seventy-fifth anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg, reported it without amendment.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time and referred as follows:

By Mr. NEELY:

A bill (S. 4091) granting an increase of pension to Susan E. Watts; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OVERTON and Mr. ELLENDER:

A bill (S. 4092) creating the Louisiana-Vicksburg Bridge Commission; defining the authority, power, and duties of said commission; and authorizing said commission and its successors and assigns to purchase, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Delta Point, La., and Vicksburg, Miss.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. BERRY:

A bill (S. 4093) to encourage the prospecting for and development of the mineral resources in the southeastern United States and to establish an assay office, testing laboratory, and experiment station at or near Knoxville, Knox County, Tenn.; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. McADOO:

A bill (S. 4094) granting an increase of pension to Minnie Wetmore Cole; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

A bill (S. 4095) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, to provide loans for the acquisition of inexpensive homes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

STANDARDS OF WAGES AND HOURS OF LABOR—AMENDMENT

Mr. OVERTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2475) to provide for the establishment of fair labor standards in employments in and affecting interstate commerce, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION AT MILITARY POSTS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. SHEPPARD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 4000) to authorize appropriations for construction and rehabilitation at military posts, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. NYE and Mr. FRAZIER, jointly, submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them to the bill (S. 4000) to authorize appropriations for construction and rehabilitation at military posts, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

RELIEF AND WORK-RELIEF APPROPRIATIONS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BONE, Mr. LUNDEEN, and Mr. SMITH each submitted an amendment and Mr. Bilbo submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 679) making appropriations for work relief, relief, and otherwise to increase employment by providing loans and grants for public-works projects, which were severally ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. GUFFEY and Mr. MURRAY, jointly, submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 679) making appropriations for work relief, relief, and otherwise to increase employment by providing loans and grants for public-works projects, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed, with illustrations, as a Senate document, a factual statement prepared at my request, as chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, by the Bureau of Navigation of the United States Navy Department, containing information as to the history, entrance requirements, the curriculum, athletics, after-graduation service of midshipmen, and other facts about the United States Naval Academy located at Annapolis, Md.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the statement will be printed as requested.

ADDRESS BY JAMES A. FARLEY BEFORE COMMONWEALTH CLUB OF CHICAGO

[Mr. LEWIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. James A. Farley before the Commonwealth Club of Chicago on Monday, May 23, 1938, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE FUTURE OF AMERICAN YOUTH—ADDRESS BY JOHN HAMILTON

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject of the Future of American Youth, delivered by John Hamilton, chairman of the Republican National Committee, before the Young Republican convention of Colorado, at Pueblo, Colo., on Saturday, May 21, 1938, which appears in the Appendix.]

PIONEERING IN HONESTY—ADDRESS BY J. EDGAR HOOVER

[Mr. McADOO asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by J. Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, at the commencement exercises, Oklahoma Baptist University, Shawnee, Okla., May 23, 1938, on the subject Pioneering in Honesty, which appears in the Appendix.]

RELIEF AND WORK-RELIEF APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 679) making appropriations for work relief, relief, and otherwise to increase employment by providing loans and grants for public-works projects.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I desire to offer to the pending joint resolution an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the clerk will read as requested.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. MALONEY to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 679) making appropriations for work relief, relief, and otherwise to increase employment by providing loans and grants for public-works projects, viz:

On page 21, beginning with line 2, strike out through line 5, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "and no funds appropriated under this title shall be allotted for any project of the character described in clause (2) or (3) of subsection (a) of this section which will compete with any privately owned or operated public utility whose rates are subject to public regulation on the date of enactment of this joint resolution (1) until such public utility has been notified by the Administrator that a competing project of such character is proposed to be financed with such funds, and (2) until such public utility (A) has rejected, or has failed to accept within 30 days after it is made, a bona fide offer by a public agency, or by or on behalf of the United States, to purchase the property of such public utility at a price fixed by a board of arbitration appointed as hereinafter provided, or (B) has failed to appoint within the time specified a member of the board to be created for the purpose of fixing such price: *Provided*, That the board of arbitration in each such case shall consist of three members, of whom one shall be appointed by the public utility, one by the public agency which is to construct such competing project or to which such project is to be leased, and one by the two members so appointed, and all such appointments shall be made within 30 days after the notification by the Administrator to the public utility as provided in clause (1) of this subsection: *Provided further*, That if the members of any such board appointed by the public utility and the public agency are unable to agree upon the third member of the board within such 30-day period, then the Governor of the State in which the competing project is proposed to be located shall, within 10 days after the expiration of such period, appoint a third member of such board: *Provided further*, That the price fixed by the board for the property of the public utility in any such case shall be fair and reasonable, shall be agreed upon by at least two members of the board, and shall be fixed within 60 days after the third member of the board is

appointed: *Provided further*, That in any case in which the Governor of any such State fails to appoint a third member of a board of arbitration within the time specified for such appointment by him, and in any case in which any such board fails to fix the price for the property of the public utility within the time specified therefor, funds appropriated under this title may be allotted for the competing project."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the agreement of the Senate, committee amendments to the joint resolution will be first considered. The first committee amendment has been stated. The amendment of the Senator from Connecticut will be printed and lie on the table for consideration at such time as he may desire to call it up.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I was about to make that request, and I do not intend to discuss the amendment at great length at this time; but I should like to discuss it for a few minutes, with the hope that I may attract the attention of the Members of the Senate to the proposal.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. I did not hear the first part of the Senator's amendment. Is it a proposed substitute for the committee amendment?

Mr. MALONEY. I am going briefly to explain that phase of the matter.

Mr. President, this amendment deals with a part of the relief joint resolution which is being much discussed and is receiving considerable attention on the part of the public. I had been informed—and the information came to me by way of the press—that the committee amendment appearing on page 21 of the joint resolution had what is known as administration approval. By way of the press I later learned that there was a probability that the majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], would offer an amendment in connection with this particular part of the joint resolution. I had hoped that at that time I might make an effort to perfect the amendment which I understood was to be offered by the majority leader. Again, still later, I learned from the press that the so-called committee amendment and the other amendment to which I have referred had been abandoned. So the proposal I offer today has been somewhat hurriedly prepared, and I discuss it now only in the hope that I may focus sufficient attention upon it to have the help of others in attempting to perfect it if the suggestion appears to be wise.

I do not know that I am in accord with the committee amendment, Mr. President, because the committee amendment provides that none of the money appropriated under the joint resolution shall be allotted to municipalities or political subdivisions desiring to acquire funds with which to build power projects which would compete with projects already in existence. Of course, I am opposed to building projects which would compete with existing power projects; but if the sovereign States of this country delegate to the municipalities within their borders the right to create and operate utility plants and take over existing plants, I think it fitting and proper that the Federal Government, which loans and grants money for other public projects, should loan and grant money for power projects.

If public ownership of utilities is on its way—and I have a feeling that it is to come—my amendment is intended only to provide for an orderly process of acquiring them. My amendment is intended to steer us away from confiscation, from chaos, from ruination and waste. If we are to have public ownership of utilities in this country, there is a right way and a fair way and an American way of bringing it about; and that way is to see that the stockholders in power companies, the persons who have risked their savings, many of them plain people, shall get a fair return and not be turned out in the cold.

I have found that it is not easy to write an amendment which would accomplish the object I have in mind; but my amendment provides for setting up a board of arbitration

of three members. It provides, first, that after an application for a loan is made, the Administrator shall serve notice on the utility in question that an application is under consideration, and that the utility shall appoint one member of a board of arbitration. It provides further that the municipality or the political subdivision or public agency shall appoint one member of the board of arbitration; and it next provides that these two persons shall appoint a third and final member of the board of arbitration.

That seems rather simple, Mr. President, but it might give an unfair advantage to the utility company if we should stop there, because it might refuse to appoint a member. So provision is made that if the utility company fails in that respect, it is in order for the Federal Government to make the allotment. The amendment further provides that if the members of the board of arbitration appointed by the public utility and the municipality or political subdivision or agency are unable to agree upon a third member, which failure to agree would cause delay and impossibility of action, the Governor of the State in which it is proposed to create the utility shall name the third member.

Further provision is made, in order that there shall be no delay, that the board of arbitration shall act within a very limited period of time. The amendment provides that if action becomes necessary, the Governor shall act within a very limited period of time. It further provides that if the Governor should fail in the responsibility delegated to him, the allotment may be made.

I think the amendment provides every possible protection for the municipality or the political subdivision or the public agency which wants to enter the public-utility field. I think it provides the necessary protection, in keeping with the solemn responsibility we have as Members of Congress, to protect the persons who have invested their money in public utilities.

Mr. President, this is a power age. There are some public-utility operators who believe that the way to success for private industry is through a sufficiently wide distribution to permit low-cost power. It seems to me that it does not make much difference whether we have public ownership or private ownership if the utility is fairly and properly operated. I believe in a wide distribution of power and in the assumption of a complete public service on the part of the utility. I believe that that is the economical way, and the way of cheap power. I have believed in rigid regulation, not only of power companies, but of industry whenever and wherever it appeared necessary for the common good. I voted for the original T. V. A. Act. I voted for the "death sentence" of the holding-company bill in 1935. I hold no brief for the power companies; but I know that the way to create chaos and uncertainty and confusion and waste is to confiscate these properties without fair and proper hearing and payment.

We have had much trouble with the railroads in late years; and, in my opinion, a large part of the reason for the trouble has been duplication which resulted in waste. Between Washington and New York, for one shining example, are parallel railroad systems, one of which is no more necessary than that I have two thumbs on one hand. Are we going to make the same mistake again with this great industry? Are we going in competition with existing plants—plants that were constructed by sweating men—to build publicly owned plants that will create waste through necessary abandonment of existing plants?

I do not think the Senate wants to take that step, Mr. President. I do not think we want to play a part in any abuse of power. As the proposal is made under this relief joint resolution that we shall loan money to municipalities for this purpose, I think we want to make certain that we shall protect the rights of persons who feel that they are oppressed, who feel that they are paying too much, that we shall give them their rights, that we shall let them have their own public-utility plants if that is their desire; but I think

we should also provide, in making that possible, rather than permitting them to enter into a wasteful competition, that they shall offer a fair price for properties which under the law they may acquire.

Because there is no opportunity to vote on this proposal now, I shall not take more of the time of the Senate this afternoon, but since this appears to me to be a matter of great magnitude, I felt that I should briefly explain the amendment and its purposes. If the occasion appears to warrant it, I shall take the liberty of taking a little more of the time of the Senate later on.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I desire to speak upon the provision in subparagraph (4), beginning with line 21, page 21, of the pending joint resolution, providing an appropriation for "projects for penal and correctional facilities under the Department of Justice, including the acquisition of land for sites therefor." This is a tremendously important appropriation, which, in my opinion, should have the approval of this body. Out of a small portion of this appropriation should come a regional jail for the Rocky Mountain area and for other areas not yet provided with housing for caring for short-term Federal prisoners.

The rate at which the Federal prison population is growing makes it imperative that additional facilities be provided for their care and treatment if serious social disturbances are to be corrected. There has been a continual growth in the number of Federal prisoners since 1925, with the exception of a short period immediately following the repeal of the Prohibition Act. Today there are 17,164 men and women in all of the Federal penal and correctional institutions, which have an aggregate normal capacity of only 13,743. Leavenworth Penitentiary, for example, has a normal capacity of 1,800, and a population of 2,975, which is almost 1,200 in excess of the number which can properly be accommodated. The result is that the prison officials have been required to resort to the unwholesome practice of "doubling up," or placing two prisoners in a single cell. They have also had to resort to using corridors, basements, and improvised dormitories for housing the constantly increasing number of Federal prisoners. Despite the fact that several new penal institutions have been constructed in the past few years, the population has continued to increase more rapidly than new facilities are being provided.

The population of all the Federal penitentiaries, reformatories, and jails under the Department of Justice is 953 in excess of the number of all Federal prisoners in the same week last year. In other words, in a single year the Federal prison population has increased sufficiently to fill one new institution. This increase does not necessarily represent, in my judgment, a growing lawlessness on the part of our citizens or a more active vigilance on the part of our enforcement officers, but it does indicate a shift in responsibility for law enforcement from the States to the central government. New criminal statutes enacted by Congress in the past 5 years have resulted in substantial additions to the population of Federal correctional institutions. Kidnaping, bank robbery, and drug addiction are now prosecuted almost exclusively in the Federal courts. Moreover, the enactment of such statutes as the Securities Exchange Act, the "hot oil" statutes, and the National Stolen Property Act has added considerably to the load of our Federal penal institutions.

The Congress has recognized the additional responsibilities which these acts throw upon governmental agencies by increasing the appropriations for the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Alcohol Tax Unit, the Secret Service, and other enforcement agencies. Just the other day, for instance, we approved the conference report on the bill authorizing the appointment of 20 additional Federal judges. Everywhere provision has been made to care for this increasing load upon the Federal law-enforcement system without making corresponding additions to our prison facilities. I do not mean to say that our very able and hard-working Committee on Appropriations has not given careful consideration to the requests they have received from the Budget Bureau, but it does seem apparent that our prison system

has not been kept abreast of the widening jurisdiction of the Federal Government over criminal offenses. Therefore I am glad that the Congress now has the opportunity of voting funds for new prison facilities, together with the acquisition of the necessary land to provide modern housing and grounds for such a purpose.

As I have stated, I am particularly anxious that under the terms of this measure provision be made for correcting the highly unsatisfactory and deplorable conditions which exist with reference to the housing of short-term Federal offenders. Now the Department of Justice boards out in local institutions most of its prisoners who have sentences of less than a year. This has long been recognized as an unsatisfactory method of handling short-term Federal offenders. I know from first-hand experience that conditions in many of the county jails in this country are incredibly shocking. They are dirty, unsanitary, insecure, and graft-ridden to a degree which makes them veritable "hell holes" and active breeders of crime.

When Judge Joseph B. Hutchinson was elevated to the bench of the district court in Texas he felt that it was his duty to find out something about the jails to which he would be sending prisoners. So he did the unusual thing; he himself went on a tour of inspection in order to ascertain just what were the conditions in the jails.

Every judge should do that. I know that many of them are familiar with the penitentiaries and the jails to which they send men who come before the bar of justice. But all of them should know something in detail about the conditions of the jails. Otherwise the sentences they impose might mean far more than they intend. A year in a certain jail might mean something far different from the kind of a year with which the judge is familiar in his ordinary experience in life.

This is what Judge Hutchinson found when he went on a tour of inspection. I quote from a speech he made before the Attorney General's conference on crime in December 1934. He said:

It became then, my imperative duty to go into county jails and find out at first hand what kind of institutions they were, and what was implied in a sentence to the county jail beyond what the law in terms prescribed. I found there conditions which apparently taken for granted by those in charge of the jails, struck me as so medieval and barbarous, and so contrary to the ordinary principles of democracy and social justice that I was shocked beyond expression. It was not any direct and malevolent cruelty toward the inmates on the part of their custodians which I found so shocking, but the very conditions of the jailing. I found that men with lungs and hearts, nerves and brains like mine were penned up for months on end with hardly a single decent thing to do. They had no access to the open air, no opportunity for any kind of exercise except in the "bull pens" and run-arounds inside of dark walls. No provision was made for their worth-while occupation or their improvement, no segregation of prisoners was attempted, no processes of restoration begun. The convicted and the unconvicted, the beginner and the hardened were condemned to a congregate life necessarily degrading.

I was amazed at the heartbreaking, morale-destroying indifference of society in permitting the maintenance of the system I saw in force. Shiftless, sloppy, antisocial, it rapidly destroyed those it had taken captive if they stayed any time there. I do not need to extend these strictures.

In America approximately 1,000,000 men and women annually get into jail. Sixty percent of these unfortunates may be classed as chronic social problems: alcoholics, vagrants, petty thieves, and other petty offenders. Thirty percent of this jail population await trial for some very serious infraction of our laws. The other 10 percent are serving short sentences for some misdemeanor—for nonsupport, traffic violations—and a certain number are not charged with crime at all, but are held as witnesses.

At the receiving door of the jail, society, if it were organized and equipped to do so, has a wonderful opportunity to deal effectively with most of the antisocial problems which make incarcerations necessary. Instead of grasping this opportunity and making the most of it, however, society too often permits the jail to become the open door to a life of crime. Many a weak character, charged with a minor infraction of the law, has found an unnatural but irresistible

influence in his first short-term jail sentence that has warped his whole life and made of him a costly liability to society for the balance of his days.

Americans have known these indisputable facts for years, but little has been done to correct the evils which are so obvious. If we should but meet this difficult problem squarely, the jail would cease to be the crime school for the criminal education of the delinquent and the weak, and could assume its proper function of curing and correcting the antisocial disease of criminal tendency at its first manifestation. Weak characters should be fortified, strengthened, and encouraged in their efforts to build up a resistance against error and not depressed and weakened by the very institutions which are supposed to have been erected to control crime. Such a ridiculous policy is just as silly as to maintain a filthy hospital fairly creeping with vermin and disease in which to nurse the sick. Society will not promote a cure in that kind of a hospital nor crime prevention in that kind of a jail.

I want to take this opportunity to pay Attorney General Cummings a much-deserved tribute for his deep interest in the jail phase of crime prevention and crime control. General Cummings realizes the importance of the jail in the crime problem. The encouragement, cooperation, and helpfulness that he is giving to Mr. James V. Bennett, Director, Bureau of Prisons, an enthusiastic public servant, is really getting results. Congress should respond to their good efforts and save the country money by wisely spending money in jail improvement.

Recently Attorney General Cummings published a very enlightening article in *Liberty* magazine, entitled "The Scandal of Our Jails." I should like to quote from it at this point:

Most of us, who try to live in such a manner that we won't go to jail, know little about what jails are like, and less about what they are for. If we think about them at all, we associate them exclusively with crime punishment. We never think of them either as instruments to crime prevention or as obstacles to that goal.

Perhaps the worst blot on the American penal picture is the county jail. And yet the average citizen knows nothing about this institution in his midst.

Senators may think that a county jail does not affect the Federal Government, but I want them to bear in mind that the Federal Government uses county jails in which to place its prisoners at so much per day, on a per diem basis, and the condition of these jails does become the responsibility of the Federal Government.

I continue to quote from Attorney General Cummings:

In the United States there are over 3,000 county jails, each one operating independently and for the most part under the jurisdiction of officials elected without consideration as to their qualifications or experience in prison work. In many instances these officials have numerous other remunerative interests and responsibilities and give little of their time to management and control of the jail. They have no qualms about delegating authority to the lowest bidder in the community, who acts more or less as a janitor, with the result that the actual management of the jail is left to the prisoners. In fact, Federal inspectors have been met at the doors of some jails by prisoners who had the keys, and apparently full control.

None of us like to read about horrors—at least, when they are real horrors, for which unconsciously we may be somewhat to blame—so I will be brief; but the reports of our investigators on the sanitary and moral conditions in large numbers of our local jails reveal a state of things which could scarcely have been tolerated in the dungeons of the Dark Ages.

No attempt is made in these offending institutions to separate male criminals from female criminals, adult criminals from youthful ones, or even to segregate prisoners with contagious diseases. Immorality of the grossest sort rages unchecked. Cells are vermin-infested. Fire hazards are ignored.

It might be assumed that local boards of health would be responsible for checking the cleanliness and sanitation of these local institutions; but our investigation showed that 2,204 out of about 3,000 county jails were never visited or inspected by local boards of health or other sanitary organizations. The following is quoted from an inspector's report:

"The sewage system has been out of commission for some time. The septic tank overflows not far from the jail kitchen, causing bad odors and great menace to health; also, causing most of the sanitary facilities to be stopped up. Since the windows have neither heavy screens nor fly screens, great swarms of flies today were seen all over the food which the prisoners were eating, and they had direct access to this awful cesspool.

Mr. President, in the last few months the people of my State of Colorado have had brought home to them in a striking manner the situation prevailing in our own county jail at Denver. About the middle of last March a 16-year-old boy by the name of George Coover was brutally murdered while confined in the county jail in Denver because he refused to submit to indignities or was unable to comply with the orders of a "kangaroo court" which was permitted to operate in that jail. In this jail the most vicious and brutal prisoners were permitted to band themselves into a mock court, and the entire management of the jail was apparently turned over to them. They fined men for breaking into the jail; they required those who could not comply with the orders of the court to perform the most menial and distasteful tasks; and they exacted acts which were revolting beyond description of those not in the favor of the "kangaroo court." Because young Coover did not comply with the orders of the "prison tier sheriff," as he is called, he was brutally and repeatedly beaten until he died. Young Coover, in America, in 1938, was sacrificed to a vicious system of degeneracy and cruelty not surpassed in dungeons of the Dark Ages nor by the traditional wicked people of Sodom and Gomorrah.

In fairness, it should be recorded here that the people of Colorado were greatly aroused and horrified over this situation in their local jail, brought out in the open by this tragic incident, and are taking action as best they can to remedy conditions.

Our Federal courts in the State of Colorado day after day are imposing sentences upon persons convicted in their courts and sending them to jails of the kind just described. But the Federal Government itself should not be dependent on the bad or indifferent local jails, usually operated on the fee system, and should be able to provide its own facilities for housing its prisoners.

We cannot escape the responsibility. We cannot blame the communities. We cannot say, "Well, that is Denver's problem," because it is not Denver's problem. It is our problem, since we have prisoners in jails of that kind.

The Federal Government should not have to take anything the local authorities are willing to grant. This whole question was studied by a special committee of the House of Representatives in 1929, and they reported that in their judgment the only remedy was for the Government to construct its own detention farms in strategic centers of population. It was their feeling that if the Government showed the States that it might be possible to centralize detention facilities the States would follow their example and require the elimination of social cesspools.

Some progress has been made in this particular, and the Federal Government has constructed about five regional jails. One of them is located in the Detroit area, one near Minneapolis, one near Los Angeles, one on the Mexican border, and one in northern Florida. The Rocky Mountain area, however, has not yet been provided with one of these institutions, and I believe a detention farm should be constructed out of a small part of the funds provided in this bill to serve the Federal Government in that region. Operating costs would be no greater than what is now being paid for the support of these same prisoners in local institutions under the most unsatisfactory conditions. I feel quite certain that the public would be afforded a much greater amount of protection if the Government would take some steps in the direction I have suggested. Incidentally, such an institution would help to reduce the overcrowding in some of the larger prisons by making it possible to remove those prisoners who could safely be trusted in an institution of the type suggested.

If this provision of the joint resolution finally is agreed to, a splendid location can be selected by the Department of

Justice in some State in the Rocky Mountain area which will measure up to all of the requirements of the Administrator of Public Works and the Director of the United States Bureau of Prisons.

Let me say in summary that out of this fund adequate provision should be made to take care of the overcrowding existing in our penal institutions and a reasonable provision made for future needs. Moreover, from \$5,000,000 to \$8,000,000 ought to be allotted for additional Federal detention farms to care for short-term Federal offenders in such parts of the country, including the Rocky Mountain area, as have not yet been provided with these facilities. Let us have some practical prison reform by cleaning up these local jails and "hoosegows" through which nearly a million men and women pass every year.

Attorney General Cummings in one of his addresses on this question pointed out that in the million men and women who enter our jails each year we have that group of people which is causing most of the trouble to our courts of justice; that we have them segregated; that we have them in a position where we can do something with them; that we have them separated from the other folks of the community. We have a wonderful opportunity, if we were only alive to it, to minister to these people, because after all they are abnormal persons. There is something wrong with them, and they might respond to treatment. Dealing with them is a practical way to prevent crime and stop the spread of lawlessness, which will conserve both the human element and the taxpayers' money.

I wish to say in conclusion that oftentimes we look upon the appropriations in such bills as the lending and spending bill as a waste of funds. I cannot see it in that light at all. When we buy better jails we are buying with that money something we need badly. I am sure that every dollar that is put into the cause which I have brought before the Senate today will not be wasted, but will bring great returns—perhaps one hundredfold. It is difficult to estimate the returns we receive from dollars so expended. So when we buy with public funds things that the country needs we are not wasting the funds at all; we are conserving them.

Mr. DAVIS obtained the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DAVIS. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know how much time the Senator from Pennsylvania proposes to occupy, and I do not wish to cut him off, but this is the fourth day the joint resolution has been under consideration, and we have not even reached the first amendment. Much discussion has been indulged in, a large portion of which, it seems to me, has had no relation to the joint resolution. It seems to me that the discussion relevant to the joint resolution might take place when the amendments are under consideration.

I do not want to interrupt the Senator from Pennsylvania; but I do express the very earnest hope that we may at once proceed to consider the amendments to the joint resolution, and take them up in order, so that we may make some progress. This is the fourth day the joint resolution has been under consideration, and we have not made any progress. I hope Senators will cooperate and try to make some progress. Everyone is talking about adjournment and is desirous of adjourning; but Congress cannot adjourn until certain legislation is completed, and the joint resolution is one of the measures without the passage of which we ought not to consider adjourning.

I hope Senators will cooperate in an effort to make progress in the consideration of the joint resolution. I do not wish my statement to be interpreted as any reflection on the Senator from Pennsylvania, or any desire to cut him off from speaking, but I hope he and others will help us make some progress with the joint resolution.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I assure the Senator from Kentucky that I shall gladly join him at any time in obtaining a vote on the joint resolution. However, I have been trying

for 2 days to obtain the floor to express briefly some views on the pending measure. My duties as a member of the joint committee appointed to investigate the Tennessee Valley Authority necessitate my absence from the Chamber in the afternoon, and I am rising to speak now because the committee reconvenes at half past 1. I shall take but 15 or 20 minutes' time to speak on the joint resolution.

Mr. President, I have maintained from the beginning of the Government's vast spending program in 1933 that it would fail to produce sound economic results if it were not accompanied by measures which would encourage business and stimulate private enterprise. I do not begrudge a single dollar which the Government has spent to provide food, shelter, and clothing for the unemployed. I know that thousands of needy citizens would have been utterly deprived of the necessities of life had it not been for this program. I have consistently voted for it. I expect to continue to support it, but I wish to make my position clear.

In my judgment, the people of the country do not object to taxes in order to pay relief and work-relief bills. The American people are fair-minded and charitable. They wish to help their neighbors in distress. However, they are thoroughly alert to the dangers of the present situation. They are acquainted with the many discouragements which have handicapped business in recent years, and they know that the centralization of work-relief administration leads to unbridled opportunities for political profiteering.

I am not trying for one moment to indicate that the local administration of relief would entirely remove it from politics. Neither do I claim that the administration of relief by the Republican Party, rather than the party now in power, would remove politics from relief. I do contend, however, that we cannot indefinitely continue along the road we have been traveling in recent years without complete economic collapse, and that it is time for us to mend our ways now, before it is too late.

It is impossible for the Government to put out \$20,000,000,000, irrespective of the party in power, without giving rise to some political abuses. I think administration leaders should frankly admit this fact. Unfortunately, they have not done so. On the other hand, they take every opportunity to gloss over the difficulties. This is, indeed, the very root of our problem. There has been a dangerous disinclination to face our economic problems in a fair and nonpartisan way. There is no place in economic and social legislation for extreme partisanship. In speaking on this measure, I do not speak as a partisan.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a statement of opinion presented to me by a notable group of women leaders from Pittsburgh.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT OF OPINION OF DELEGATION FROM PITTSBURGH, ALLEGHENY COUNTY, PA., REGARDING PUMP-PRIMING BILL

The delegation present this morning representing many types of organizations of Pittsburgh and Allegheny County, Pa., have come to express our personal opinion of certain provisions of the pump-priming bill. This bill, introduced into the House of Representatives May 9, 1938, appropriating over \$3,000,000,000 for relief and pump priming provides for the administration of this vast sum by the Chief Executive of the United States. Since the passage of this bill in the House on May 12, we have interested our community in an amendment which we desire to call to your attention this morning. We do not object to the pump-priming bill, but we wish to register our disapproval of the method of administering this sum of money.

We admit two points very definitely. The country is in great need of immediate relief to the men and families unemployed at the present time. It has been estimated that 13,000,000 of American people belong to that class. We are fearful that the Nation is drifting slowly but steadily into financial collapse. To meet the relief problem means the expenditure of vast sums of money, but to prevent the occurrence of this collapse means the most careful and economic administration of public funds. We also admit that this relief problem is of national scope, but this national scope refers only to the area of the Nation. Therefore, we believe that the condition of the country justifies a bill for

the expenditure of money for the welfare of those unable to secure employment.

We believe the fundamental weakness of the bill in its present form is the centralization of the power of administration of the funds in the hands of the Chief Executive. To take this power of administration from the local municipalities and States is basically wrong. The problem of the poor and unemployed is not a new problem. We are not faced with something that is unknown in history. For centuries this problem has been present in all organized society. A long-established principle for the handling of relief both in England and in America is that it is peculiarly a function of local government. The problem is nationwide in area, but it can be solved only by local units of administration.

A historical example of the results of a whole nation unit of administration of relief is that of the Roman Empire. Vast sums of money were administered by the ruler of that great empire, providing free sustenance and entertainment for the inhabitants of Rome and other large cities. This has been cited as one of the fundamental reasons for the downfall of the Roman Empire.

We believe that the administration of this relief money should be in the hands of local commissions. These commissions should represent the finest citizens of each municipality. The personnel of these commissions should be nonpartisan. And the most fundamental requirement should be that they serve without pay. Unpaid commissions have proven their value in the past, and at this great crisis of our Government can prove effective again. The conclusions may be drawn that unpaid commissions will not work. Two excellent examples might be cited. In England justices of the peace, whose duties are of far greater scope than the persons of that title in the United States, serve effectively without pay. During the crisis of the World War the local draft boards in the United States served in each municipality without pay. No one can deny the effectiveness of their work.

We, therefore, propose that an amendment be added to the pump-priming bill relieving the President or Chief Executive of the power of administration of these several billions of dollars for relief, and to provide for the administration of this fund through local, nonpartisan, unpaid commissions, composed of representative citizens of each municipality. We recommend this amendment because we believe most firmly that administration of this fund locally will prevent any political patronage, will save millions of dollars for administration, will be carefully allotted to those in each community who need funds for the necessities of life, and will save the taxpayers millions of dollars. We express our interest in this proposed amendment not only for our own sakes as taxpayers but because we realize that already the lives of our children have been mortgaged by debt created during these past two depressions beyond their ability to pay.

Mrs. Arnold M. Replogle, president of the National Legislative Council on State Government; Mrs. H. W. Adams, member of the board of the Legislative Health Council, executive committee member of the Maternal Health Center, member of the Legislative Council; Mrs. J. E. Baldrige, active in D. A. R.; Mrs. W. Z. Burns; Mrs. T. C. Cheeseman, Federation of Clubs, Board of Girl Scouts of Allegheny County; Mrs. S. J. Corbett, president of the Outlook Alliance, honorary lifetime president of Bellevue Womans Club; Mrs. Carl S. Coler; Mrs. Samuel D. Ewart, president of the College Club; Mrs. Stephen Goodale, member of the board of the College Club and past president; Mrs. Eva Holliday, Dormont Women's Club; Mrs. Vernon L. Hubbard; Mrs. Frank Johnson, member of Federation of Clubs; Mrs. Florine Koegler, Women's City Club of Pittsburgh; Mrs. William B. McFall, president of Fortnightly Review, Mount Lebanon Women's Club, Federation of Clubs; Mrs. D. Edwin Miller, head of Women's Auxiliary of the Salvation Army, president of Allegheny County Scholarship Association; Mrs. John M. Phillips, past president of the Federation of Women's Clubs of Pennsylvania; Mrs. John Charles Runk, Federation of Women's Clubs of Pennsylvania; Mrs. Thomas J. Tyndall, very active in Parent-Teachers Association, Federation of Clubs of Pennsylvania, Woman's Club of Duquesne; Mrs. T. D. Yensen, active in Forest Hills club work; Mrs. John W. Rehling, deputy commissioner of Girls Scouts of Allegheny County, first vice president of Women's Club of Pittsburgh.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, in my judgment, this petition represents the desire of our citizens to approach unemployment and relief problems in a fair-minded and responsible way. These women represent a large number of other practical and helpful American women who would be willing to serve on nonpartisan relief boards in every community throughout the Nation without a dollar's compensation. They would be willing to work faithfully; and no one can deny their fine abilities. These women are animated by the true American spirit. They come to the Government offering their splendid services as volunteers. This is the spirit which has led this country to victory and glorious achievement in the work of the Red Cross, the Salvation Army, the

Community Chests, and the Committee for the Mobilization of Human Needs.

If our Government at this critical time in our national history refuses to accept the offer of citizens, both men and women, who now come forward as volunteers, the administration will have something for which to answer which it will never be able adequately to explain. What these noble women from Pittsburgh are now ready and willing to do, men and women all over the country in every district, county, and community likewise want to do. The acceptance and utilization of their services will help to remove politics from relief and will provide a great saving for the Government. More funds can be made directly available to the needy and the way can be gradually paved for the restoration of relief and work relief to State and local administration.

Mr. President, I am not asking for any abrupt change. I am not denying the need for work-relief funds. I am asking something which I believe to be thoroughly reasonable and practicable. I ask that nonpartisan boards of volunteer workers be instituted throughout the country, in every State, city, and county, so that the cost of administering work relief may be diminished and more money may be made available at once to those who are in distress.

I have made crystal clear, by my consistent vote for relief, work relief, and public works, that I look upon these problems in a thoroughly nonpartisan way. I ask that those who administer these funds practice the same consideration in behalf of national needs. In my judgment, the administration could not now do anything which would be more helpful to the country as a whole than to give leadership to our people in giving American business and free enterprise encouragement and fair play. Since 1933 I have witnessed attack after attack upon business made by various leaders of the administration. Business has come to believe that the administration is opposed to the making of a fair profit. If this be true, it is indeed a situation which will finally lead to national disaster. The fact that business generally believes this to be true is now holding back the course of economic recovery. In appreciation of this difficulty, the executive council of the American Federation of Labor has made a most timely declaration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, the official text of the statement issued by the executive council of the American Federation of Labor on May 4.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The executive council of the American Federation of Labor regards the present moment as most opportune and timely for a declaration of its basic aims and objectives.

Unemployment can only be overcome through the creation of work opportunities for working men and women in private industry. This is the real remedy for unemployment. The time has arrived when, through cooperation, understanding, and a proper regard for the rights of all employers and employees, industry and labor should get together and seek to find a way by which this real remedy for idleness can be applied.

The American Federation of Labor is committed to the principle of private ownership, private initiative, and the protection of private property. The right to own and manage property must be conceded and safeguarded.

Working people must be accorded the right to organize and bargain collectively. The highest wages which industry can afford should be paid, and a fair return upon legitimate investments to those who own private property must be freely conceded.

Labor and capital can cooperate, develop efficiency, and production through labor organizations developed by the workers and through the organization of industry, as developed by industrial management.

Through the establishment of contractual relationships, industrial peace can be promoted and industrial production stabilized. Contracts entered into between organized labor and industrial management must be regarded as sacred obligations. They must be religiously observed.

The principle of industrial democracy through which labor and management may solve their common economic problems should be recognized and applied in all industrial relationships.

Organizations of labor should be governed by democratic policies, rules, and procedure. This is the American way. It is in conformity with modern requirements and democratic principles.

Through the development of teamwork between industry and labor, many economic wrongs can be righted, many of industry's

legislative burdens can be remedied, and the maximum of service which industry and labor may render can be given the entire Nation.

Labor invites industry to discard the weapons of industrial warfare directed against labor by employers' associations both now and in days gone by. Let us all have a new vision of the changed attitude between labor and capital. It means the substitution of cooperation and understanding for industrial strife. All of this is easy of accomplishment, because all that is required is to respect and recognize the economic, legal, and industrial rights of both labor and capital.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, the American Federation of Labor has taken the first step in what I hope will be a movement for general appeasement in this country. I believe the administration could do nothing more helpful than to put its official stamp of approval upon this document, and to follow this chart in its future relations with American business.

I ask unanimous consent to have introduced in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, a few brief telegrams and a letter which I have received, indicating opposition to the so-called Boileau amendment. It is asserted that it would throw many men out of work, because the Government would be placed in direct competition with lime and limestone manufacturers.

There being no objection, the communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSHOHOCKEN, Pa., May 21, 1938.

Hon. J. J. DAVIS,

United States Senate:

Boileau amendment to House Joint Resolution 679 includes projects for the production of material for fertilizing soil for distribution to farmers. This would put the Government in direct competition with lime and limestone manufacturers and would in many and probably most cases ruin these manufacturers, also throwing many men out of work. We would appreciate your opposing this as forcefully as possible.

G. AND W. H. CORSON.

WHITEROCK QUARRIES,
Bellefonte, Pa., May 19, 1938.

Hon. JAMES J. DAVIS,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR DAVIS: We hope that you will vote against the relief bill which provides for State production of fertilizing materials, for the reason that we feel this is a further attempt to put government into business. Furthermore, we doubt if the various States could produce fertilizing materials as cheaply as they are able to purchase them under existing economic conditions.

I understand that the bill in question is House Joint Resolution 679, and we hope that you will give this measure your very careful consideration, in which event we believe that you will oppose it.

Respectfully yours,

RAY C. NOLL.

HILLVILLE, Pa., May 20, 1938.

Senator JAMES DAVIS,

Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:

House Joint Resolution No. 679 provides for the building and operating of agricultural liming plant with moneys from Federal relief bill. Please vote "no" on this bill when it comes up for passage in the Senate. The production, sale, and distribution of agricultural limestone products is a very competitive commodity and is widely distributed over the State wherever suitable deposits of limestone occur. The building and operating of additional plants by the Government cannot be of as much benefit to the farmer as the present money allowance given him on the limestone products he buys. The capacity of plants privately owned is at least three times greater than the demand. The building of more plants can only result in curtailed output of present established producers and cause further unemployment to their workmen, which now have only 2 and 3 days per week. We beg you, in the interest of employees, truckers, distributors, and taxpaying establishments, to vote "no" on this resolution.

Respectfully yours,

F. O. EARNSHAW,
President, Carbon Limestone Co.

NEWCASTLE, Pa., May 19, 1938.

Hon. JAMES J. DAVIS,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

We are opposed to the Boileau amendment in House Joint Resolution 679, lines 24 and 25 of page 2, lines 1 and 2 of page 3. Wherever limestone is produced in Pennsylvania there are plants producing agricultural lime, which is entirely a seasonable business, so further governmental competition would not help the unemployment situation. We strongly urge you to recommend through the appropriations committee that this amendment be stricken out of the relief bill.

UNION LIMESTONE CO.

NEWCASTLE, Pa., May 19, 1938.

Hon. JAMES J. DAVIS,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

We wish to voice our opposition to amendment of relief bill as offered by Congressman BOILEAU, of Wisconsin, and accepted by the House, and identified as House Joint Resolution 679, lines 24 and 25, page 2, and lines 1 and 2 of page 3.

Would be injurious to established industry. Wherever limestone is found in Pennsylvania plants are in operation producing agricultural lime.

Being a seasonable product, would not be an aid to unemployment, and only tends to further aggravate governmental competition. We urge you to protest the acceptance of this particular amendment.

NEWCASTLE LIME & STONE CO.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I am unwilling to support at the present time any measure which will give occasion for increased unemployment. I believe Government policy should now be to encourage business institutions already at work, rather than to attempt Government-financed projects which may compete unfairly with them. Private enterprise is having a desperate struggle to survive. It needs fair treatment and encouragement from the Government rather than punitive measures and unfair competition.

Mr. GERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Dieterich	King	Pepper
Andrews	Donahey	La Follette	Pittman
Austin	Duffy	Lee	Pope
Bankhead	Ellender	Lewis	Radcliffe
Barkley	Frazier	Lodge	Russell
Berry	George	Logan	Schwartz
Bilbo	Gerry	Loneragan	Schwellenbach
Bone	Gibson	Lundeen	Sheppard
Borah	Gillette	McAdoo	Shipstead
Brown, Mich.	Glass	McCarran	Smathers
Brown, N. H.	Green	McGill	Smith
Bulkley	Guffey	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Bulow	Hale	McNary	Thomas, Utah
Burke	Harrison	Maloney	Townsend
Byrd	Hatch	Miller	Truman
Byrnes	Hayden	Milton	Vandenberg
Capper	Herring	Minton	Van Nuys
Caraway	Hill	Murray	Wagner
Chavez	Hitchcock	Neely	Walsh
Clark	Holt	Norris	Wheeler
Connally	Hughes	Nye	White
Copeland	Johnson, Calif.	O'Mahoney	
Davis	Johnson, Colo.	Overton	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Ninety Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. COPELAND obtained the floor.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York permit me to present one or two telegrams and brief observations in connection with them?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I read a telegram from William B. Taylor, of Detroit, Mich., the director of welfare for the United Automobile Workers' Union. In other words, this is a request and suggestion coming from labor itself with respect to the relief problem, and I think it is so typical of the contemplation which the country is calculated to confront in its larger cities during the next few months that it is worth emphasizing. I read the telegram from Mr. Taylor:

In order to prevent mass starvation in many communities in Michigan it is important that a portion of funds to be appropriated for W. P. A. be allocated for direct relief. Urge you use your influence in this direction.

Mr. President, here is the contemplation: The unemployment problem is constantly becoming more acute, and there is no prospect of a recession in the recession; as it becomes more acute, the relief problem in the larger cities proportionately becomes more acute. It is simply a physical impossibility to consider meeting the total problem in the larger cities on a work-relief basis. The work could not be made, to begin with, and it could not be paid for if it were made. The direct relief formula inescapably and unavoidably must be at the bottom of adequate relief facilities in communities such as Detroit and even in lesser industrial centers. What I am saying applies just as much to other sections of the country as it does to Michigan.

Mr. President, it seems to me that this emphasizes what I was trying to say last Monday. It seems to me that it is impossible much longer to subdivide relief and subdivide the relief challenge, undertaking to say that part of it, as respects employables, shall be handled by the Federal Government at Federal expense, and that the rest of it, as affects unemployables and such employables as cannot be employed by W. P. A., shall be handled by local authorities at local expense. As this telegram indicates, the problem is now multiplying to such an extent that funds for direct relief must be increased. Local resources are not equal to this necessity in many places. It seems to me that what I was undertaking to say on Monday, and the objectives which I set forth in the substitute which I have offered for title I, are almost inescapable as we proceed into the realities of our problems this summer and fall.

I submit that a given community—let us use Detroit as an example—should have an opportunity to allocate the sum total of its relief funds to its own problem in the fashion that its problem requires.

W. P. A. has been very generous with Detroit—still using Detroit as an example—there is no complaint in the world about the work-relief attitude that has been displayed up to date. But there cannot be a W. P. A. attitude toward this problem which meets it or which saves it from a dire and desperate crisis in the very near future.

The House relief joint resolution specifically declines the use of any Federal funds for direct relief; the Senate joint resolution sets aside \$50,000,000 for optional direct-relief purposes. The \$50,000,000, in my judgment, will not be a drop in the bucket compared to the necessities which will be confronted as this situation develops during the next few months.

I submit that this contemplation squarely sustains the theory of relief legislation which I was undertaking to present on Monday last, and which subsequently will come before the Senate for a vote when my substitute for title I is presented.

When the relief problem reaches such magnitude that it no longer can be met by W. P. A. assistance through provision of work relief, we have certainly come to a point where all our relief resources, as a whole, should be dedicated to the problem as a whole under one responsibility which undertakes to survey the problem as a whole.

That is just exactly contrary to the theory of the pending legislation. With the single exception of the one \$50,000,000 appropriation for direct relief, the pending legislation continues on the old theory that there is divided responsibility, continues the old discriminations which, as I indicated 2 days ago, result in paying one reliever \$53 a month, and another reliever \$22 a month, each citizen of equal rights, each confronting the same necessities, yet one enjoying what amounts to a special favor because he happens to fall within a classification which the Federal Government has adopted on the strength of its resources, while the other one is forced to a sub-subsistence basis because he is unfortunate enough to fall into the category which the Federal formula asserts must be solely and completely a local responsibility.

Mr. President, this telegram from Mr. Taylor, which is duplicated by numerous other telegrams from industrial areas, it seems to me presents the Senate with the unavoidable question whether the time is not already here when the relief problem must be confronted as a whole, and relief resources must be put at the disposal of States and local communities to be handled as a whole, under a single responsibility which can fit the resources to the local needs.

While I am on my feet I desire to present one other protest from the Detroit area, and again from labor sources. This time it is a letter from Mr. Frank X. Martel, the president of the Detroit and Wayne County Federation of Labor. I wish to read what Mr. Martel has to say:

It has been repeatedly announced by Gov. Frank Murphy and others that the national administration has given unlimited authorization to place everyone in Michigan to work that needs work, through the W. P. A. Up to the present time, with the exception of a favored few, the W. P. A. administrators in Michi-

gan have refused to accept for W. P. A. employment anyone except those who are first placed on welfare and then transferred to the W. P. A.

Many thousands of worthy citizens have battled for the past 6 or 8 years to keep off the welfare. They do not want the dole; they are trying to keep their names clear from having accepted charity; they want work and in this group will be found most of the skilled mechanics of this community who are now unemployed.

Louis J. Nims, State director of W. P. A., and his assistant, Max Barton, Wayne County director of W. P. A., have insisted on a policy of refusing to accept on W. P. A. for employment anyone unless they are first placed on relief. This has resulted in a discrimination against many thousands of decent citizens in this community. It has also resulted in placing on work as skilled mechanics men who are unfit by training for this work. It is depriving those trained through regular channels of an opportunity to work at their trade. It is training new men to take their place and it is depriving the people and merchants of this community of funds set up by the Federal Government for relief of unemployed while forcing the State and cities to carry on welfare some 70,000 people who could and should be transferred to W. P. A. and many thousands of men who want work on W. P. A. but can't get on without first taking the pauper's oath.

We ask—

This is the Detroit and Wayne County Federation of Labor which poses the question—

We ask, Are you going to stand for this?

Are we going to stand for what? For a Federal regulation which insists that a victim of the depression cannot enjoy work relief aid via W. P. A. except as he approaches it through the public welfare, and has himself first been on direct relief.

I understand that that practice is universal. It virtually amounts to the requirement of a pauper's oath in order to approach work relief under W. P. A. I have never known the Senate or the House to approve the pauper's oath in any form related to this sort of legislation whenever that issue has arisen; yet here, in connection with the Federal contribution to relief, we virtually confront the situation—it is precisely this in net result—that a pauper's oath must precede a place upon W. P. A. The net result, of course, is directly and emphatically to discriminate against those, shall we say, thrifter citizens who have been endeavoring through the years, from their own scant resources, still to maintain themselves on the basis of their own equipment and purpose to take care of themselves.

That is another of the discriminations. I agree with Mr. Martel's letter that it is a perfectly insufferable discrimination, and it is a discrimination which ought not to be tolerated.

I want to continue Mr. Martel's letter:

We demand in the name of decency and fair treatment that the thousands of abandoned mechanics who are now being discriminated against by Nims and Barton be accorded a fair treatment and an opportunity for employment on W. P. A. in accord with the intent of Congress when the appropriation was made and the law passed.

This organization has stood squarely behind the President in his administration. There is only one way to properly remedy this condition—

Without continuing to read the letter—because it proposes the removal of certain W. P. A. officials in Michigan, a matter upon which I have no opinion, because at the moment I am not interested in that phase of the matter—I ask that the entire letter may be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. VANDENBERG. I again emphasize the fact that the letter deals with one more of the discriminations which are inherent in the dual relief system which the joint resolution once more undertakes to perpetuate upon the country.

The discriminations cannot be defended. Discriminations as between two like families on the same street in the same town, with equal relief necessities, one of which is forced to live on \$22 per month while the other lives on \$53 per month, are un-American and indefensible. Now comes the discrimination to which Mr. Martel referred—a discrimination as between the citizen who has tried to support himself, and who, simply because he has succeeded

in keeping off relief up to date, is now refused work relief under W. P. A., and the chap who willingly has gone to relief for the past 4 or 5 years, and, because he has fine relief credentials, can qualify for a job under W. P. A.

The discriminations, I repeat, are inherent in the formula which the pending joint resolution insists upon fixing once more upon the country. Worse than that, however, is the original challenge which was submitted in the telegram from Mr. Taylor, that until the States and local communities are permitted to deal with their relief problem as a whole, so that they may assess all of their relief resources and allocate them equitably to all who shall be dependent upon the communities for relief—until this is changed, and until it is changed, I very respectfully submit, as is proposed in the substitute I have offered for title I, the relief problem will not only continue to plague the Government of the United States, it will not only continue to threaten and jeopardize the public credit of the United States, but it will continue to be an utterly inhumane thing in its inequalities as between citizens of the United States.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. Am I to understand from the telegram that the person sending it is of the opinion that if the administration of relief were turned over entirely to the local authorities it could not only be administered more equitably and justly, but it could be administered at less expense?

Mr. VANDENBERG. No; the telegram does not deal with those phases of the matter at all. Those are my observations regarding the system against which the telegram protests. So far as the telegram is concerned, it confines itself to an assertion that unless more of the pending funds are made available for direct relief, instead of practically all being made available for work relief, there will be "mass starvation in many communities in Michigan."

I wonder if I have made myself clear to the Senator.

Mr. BORAH. I think I understand the matter as the Senator explains it; but I am asking the question because I am not yet clear—although I presume I should be, because I have listened to the discussion—wherein the Senator's program would work more equitably and at less expense than the program we now have or the one which is proposed by the pending joint resolution.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I shall be very happy to briefly advert to that subject again.

Mr. BORAH. I think it is exceedingly important.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I do, too.

Mr. BORAH. And I want to be sure I understand the proposition as the Senator understands it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let me very briefly summarize my conception of the thing. I am not now undertaking to quote the author of the telegram; I am merely saying that, so far as the telegram is concerned, it verifies the existence of a condition which, in my judgment, cannot be met under the existing system.

So far as my own opinion goes, I say to the Senator, first, that if all of the available Federal funds for relief for the next 12 months were to be divided equitably by nonpartisan authorities here in Washington and allocated to the States on the basis of a formula which should consider the extent of unemployment, local resources, and the other factors which are usually included in connection with Federal allocations, each State would then receive and would know precisely what the sum total of Federal contribution would be to its entire relief problem for the ensuing year.

Suppose the State of Idaho were to receive \$100,000,000 as its share of the sum total allocation for the year.

Mr. BORAH. From the Federal Government?

Mr. VANDENBERG. From the Federal Government. Then the State of Idaho, knowing what local tax resources it could afford to add to its \$100,000,000, could decide for itself what its total resources would be for the ensuing year, both Federal and local. Then it could count its employables who are on relief and its unemployables who are now on

direct relief, and it could decide for itself whether it could still afford to have any work relief at all. Perhaps it cannot afford to have any work relief at all if the problem has grown so large and there are so many people dependent on relief that there is not enough money to provide work relief for anyone. The State can then decide, in the presence of the actual resources available for relief, how much per capita it can spend upon those who require relief.

At the present time in the State of Idaho, under the existing system, this is what happens. I do not know the exact Idaho figures; I am now using the figures for the average of the country. This is what happens in Idaho if Idaho's experience is that of the average of the country. Idaho has so many employables who need relief. They live on \$53 a month, which comes from the Federal Treasury. Idaho also has an equal or perhaps a larger number of so-called employables who are not eligible for Federal help, and who must rely solely and exclusively upon State and local resources. Such persons average \$22 a month. So, in Idaho at the present time there are two classes of relievers, the special, privileged class among relievers, those who get work relief by way of Federal support, enjoying a living at the rate of \$53 a month, if it may be called enjoying it. Those who are so unfortunate, however, as to be dependent upon State and local resources live on only \$22 a month, citizens in the same town, on the same street, enjoying equal rights, having equal necessities and equal appetites, one con-signed to live on \$22 a month, and the other given the privilege of living on \$53 a month. Again I say, if that is a privilege, I am sorry I have to use the word.

If the problem in Idaho reaches the point where there are so many persons who cannot be employed on work relief that they must be cared for by State and local resources—I mean the \$22-a-month class—if that class reaches the point where Idaho no longer can raise even \$22 a month to support them, then I submit that Idaho confronts a desperate crisis. What I am saying, and what my substitute would undertake, would be to say to Idaho, "Idaho, here is the money we were going to send you at \$53 a month for your employables. Take that and put it with your local resources, and decide for yourself how much of it you can afford to spend per capita. If you cannot afford to have work relief, you might just as well admit it and not try to have it. If you have to go back to what is unhappily called a dole, if there is no escape from it, you might better go to it than to run away from a word; and, in trying to escape from a word, run into complete bankruptcy, both of the Federal Government and of all your local and State governments alike."

Are not the nonpartisan relief authorities in Idaho infinitely better off in dealing with the sum total of their problem if they have received this money which the Federal Government is willing to spend upon the relief problem in Idaho, and Idaho is allowed to put that in its own common relief purse, supplemented by such funds as Idaho itself can afford to spend? Then Idaho, intimately acquainted with its own problem, knowing infinitely better than anyone in Washington can know what the Idaho necessities are, can apply these total resources to its total relief problem and produce equity as between its citizens.

Mr. BORAH. I now understand how it can produce equity; I think that is clear enough. But if conditions continue to develop as they have been developing, the ultimate end of the proposition is inflation or repudiation.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I have not any doubt in the world of that, or else a capital levy, or something like it. But I submit to the Senator that we are running infinitely faster toward one of these three dire alternatives, namely, inflation, repudiation, or a capital levy, when we continue to proceed on this present pump-priming theory, because we know what pump priming does to the Federal Budget, and we know that pump priming does not cure the economic situation. We have taken the biggest dose of it in the last 6 years that any nation ever took or ever could take, and that

dose was a failure. Yet all that we are offered today is a smaller dose of the same thing that failed before. So if we are at all in danger of this ultimate repudiation, or inflation, or supertaxation by a capital levy, we are infinitely more in danger of it by continuing the amazingly inept formula which is perpetuated in the pending joint resolution.

Mr. POPE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield to the junior Senator from Idaho.

Mr. POPE. Before the W. P. A. was established we had the Federal emergency relief organization, and the Federal Government sent to the Governor of our State a certain amount of money, to be used by the State officials and the local officials in giving relief. As I understand, that was similar at least to the suggestion made by the Senator.

I was told that in one community in a State where local officials were on the relief board one or two of them decided to run for office. They went out into the community and rounded up all the people they could and put them on the relief rolls, because it was their thought that that would assist them in their campaigns for election. In this community it was claimed that there was an unusually large amount of money being used, too much. It was also said that in some instances the local officials, in order to get money to give to these people, would make their list just as large as they could. I do not know this to be true, but there were many charges of that sort.

If the Senator's proposal were followed and the money were turned over to the State to be administered in about the same way that the I. E. R. A., as it was called in Idaho, or the F. E. R. A., as it was called in the Nation, was administered, would not that situation exist as it did before and would we not have politics in the situation to a large extent? Now at least we do not have existing the situation of local administrations trying to make political capital out of relief.

I ask the Senator whether the same tendency would not exist under his proposed substitute?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, the Senator has asked a perfectly fair question, and it is one I should like briefly to discuss. I cannot answer it in a word.

I have no doubt that we will have politics in relief no matter who administers relief, whether it is a Federal authority or a State authority or a local authority, a Republican authority or a Democratic authority or any other authority. That is a sin and a shame, but it is a fact. Our only hope is to circumscribe it as much as possible.

I call the attention of the Senator to the fact that the administration of the relief fund under the substitute for title I, which I have offered and which was offered in the House of Representatives and voted down, the direction and administration of the fund would be in charge, first, of a nonpartisan relief commission in Washington, which, in turn, would require the erection of nonpartisan relief authorities in each State as the recipients and administrators of the Federal funds. To that extent the situation would totally differ from the situation which the Senator describes as existing a few years ago, because at that time the local distribution, insofar as it was supervised at all externally, was supervised by Federal authority.

I think we have now reached a point, I may say to the Senator, in addition, where there exists a far more acute local sense of outrage, upon the one hand, and of responsibility, upon the other hand, for the appropriate administration of relief. I think that every community in this country has had enough object lessons in waste and exploitation and indolence so that the community is instantly more acute today than ever before to the challenge of the relief problem. Therefore, I think that if we could ever get the responsibility for the administration of relief back to the States and to the local governments, we would have it policed because of a sense of local responsibility and a feeling of neighborhood opinion, which are the only things in this world that ever can cause it to be successfully policed. It will never be policed so long as these funds come direct from Washington and continue to be explicit from Washington,

and no local responsibility is involved, because, again, unfortunate as it may be, the fact remains that the best of our constituents back home still seem to feel that if a check comes from Washington it comes from some magic pot of gold which no one ever has to replace or pay for.

Mr. POPE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GILLETTE in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. POPE. I did not mean to suggest a few moments ago that all the local authorities by any means, or even any considerable number of local authorities, went so far as to attempt to get men on the rolls for political reasons or for local reasons, but it is said that did occur at least a number of times. I often heard that the local officials would try to get all the money they could; they would increase the number on the rolls in every way that seemed to them to be fair under the law, and so it was exceedingly difficult to cut down the numbers on those rolls.

The complaint was often made that those who had charge would pad the rolls, they would keep them up, because it meant relief, it meant money for their local communities, and the question of local pride would enter into the consideration, and in some cases there would even be a competition or a rivalry to get money. That is the point I wanted to call to the Senator's attention.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I have no doubt that that condition occurred, and I have no doubt that it would still occur in perhaps lesser degree; but my view is that to whatever extent it occurs it cannot be remotely the menace that exists in the opportunity for manipulation and political prejudice and favoritism inherent in a system that distributes three or four or five billion dollars from one central point in Washington to fortunate and, perhaps, subservient beneficiaries throughout the country.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. LUNDEEN. When the Senator says that Idaho—assuming that to be the State—is to get \$100,000,000, who is to determine how the allocation is to be made of the amount, say, of \$150,000,000 to Utah and \$100,000,000 to Idaho? What authority is proposed to determine the amount?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I shall be very glad to read to the Senator from Minnesota the precise machinery that is provided for that purpose:

Such amount shall be allocated by the Federal Relief Board (hereinafter established), with the approval of the President, among the several States upon the basis of the board's findings and conclusions with respect to the facts concerning and weight to be given to unemployment and living costs in, and population and financial resources of, the several States.

The Federal relief board hereinafter to be established is—

Composed of three members appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Not more than two of the members of the board shall be members of the same political party.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Will the Senator again yield to me?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes, indeed.

Mr. LUNDEEN. What I am interested in is this: The power proposed to be given the board is a tremendous power; and does the Senator feel that his amendment safeguards the situation?

Mr. VANDENBERG. It is a tremendous power, Mr. President, and it is a terribly dangerous power, in spite of all the safeguards that anyone can provide; but I submit to the Senator that the only choice we have is what seems to be the lesser of two evils; and if it is a tremendous power, it is at least a better safeguarded power in the hands of three nonpartisan administrators than it is when it is left exclusively and solely in the hands of a single Presidential executive, who, of necessity, is a political officer of the Government.

Mr. LUNDEEN. If the Senator will permit me again to interrupt him, I wish to say that I am greatly interested in knowing whether the Senator feels that under this provision we would have better safeguards than we have at present?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Very definitely so.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Michigan a question?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LEWIS. Assuming the board proposed by the Senator from Michigan has been constituted, assuming that the members vote to transmit money to the different States or counties—to what organization in the respective counties, cities, or States is it the Senator's object or purpose to trust this expenditure after the money has reached the States from the board proposed by the Senator?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I shall be very glad to answer the Senator. I now read from page 2 of the substitute:

(b) The sum allocated to a State under subsection (a) shall be paid quarterly by order of the Federal Relief Board to the State if—

(1) The Governor has certified to the Federal Relief Board that there has been established a board of relief trustees in such State, the membership of which is not composed solely of individuals who are members of the same political party, and that such board has the power and duty of receiving and disbursing sums which may be granted such State under this section.

Mr. LEWIS. Who does the able Senator think will constitute that board in the State?

Mr. VANDENBERG. As the language indicates, the State has its own option to create its own board of trustees in any fashion it may see fit, so long as it comports with this general criteria.

Mr. LEWIS. Then if appointed by the Governor of the State, the board is appointed by an official who comes into office through politics, and naturally appoints those in whom he has confidence? Would the Senator not say so?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes.

Mr. LEWIS. Then, under those circumstances, are we not back right to where we now are, that the Governor transmits the power to some of his chosen people after the money has been transmitted by the administrator in Washington?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I do not think so.

Mr. LEWIS. That would be my viewpoint, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. When Congress enacted the Social Security law it provided that the Federal Government should put up one-half of the expenses of administering the old-age pension administration in the States, and provided for the administration of the unemployment insurance feature of that law an outright grant 100 percent. The Federal Government did not retain any jurisdiction whatever over the appointment of the agents who are to administer the law in the States. It did require a certain amount of matching on the part of the States with respect to old-age pensions. It did not require such matching with respect to unemployment insurance.

Does the Senator know of any State in the Union where the old-age pension gratuities or payments are being administered wholly by the State under officers appointed by the chief executive of the State, or does he know of any State where the unemployment insurance is being so administered by agents appointed by the State, with the Federal authority having not even the power to accept or reject the appointments, or have any control over them? Does the Senator know of any such State that is free from politics in the administration of the old-age pension law and the unemployment insurance law, notwithstanding the fact that in one case half the money is being put up by the Federal Government and in the other case all of it?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am sorry, I do not have the information regarding those local administrative units.

Mr. BARKLEY. I call attention to it, because the Senator seems to be laboring under the impression that notwithstanding the money for relief is to be appropriated by the Federal Government, yet if it shall be under the control of some State authority the situation is therefore purified to the extent that no politics will enter into the situation.

Mr. VANDENBERG. No, Mr. President; I said a moment ago that I know there is to be politics in relief; no matter what formula we have and no matter what party administers it, we are bound to have politics. It is inherent in democracy. My only hope is to find the lesser of the evils in this aspect, and I continue to have the feeling in regard to the relief problem that the closer we get back to the home folks themselves with respect to it, the closer we are to the only kind of scrutiny that can ever hope to police it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Unfortunately, I think it is true that the closer we get back home, the more political scrutiny is engaged in, because the local influence of friends and acquaintances and lifelong associations may have some political effect upon a local administrator, whereas it would not reach all the way to Washington—at least, presumably it would not—in determining who should be the beneficiaries of the relief funds provided.

I realize all the difficulties the Senator has in mind, and I am fairly well acquainted with some of them.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am sure the Senator speaks feelingly.

Mr. BARKLEY. When the Federal Government puts up the money for relief, or for any other purpose, to be administered by the States, I think it is a mistake to assume that the State authority will not take the same advantage in the administration of that appropriation that it does in the case of funds raised by the State's own methods of taxation, and expended directly.

For 25 years we have been appropriating money to build highways in the United States, and we have been requiring the States to match the Federal funds in the construction of highways; yet it is unfortunately true that there never has been an administration in any State with which I am acquainted which has not used its highway department to perpetuate itself or its friends in office, and thereby used also the funds granted by the Federal Government. The personnel of all the State highway commissions is controlled by the State administration, and not by the Federal Government in Washington. It is unfortunately true that we cannot remove such things from politics, because in a sense politics now enters into everything because of the complexity of our economic and social problems, which require the Government—whether it be Federal, State, or local—to enter in some way the equation with respect to everything which affects every local community in the United States.

Mr. POPE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Michigan one other question regarding a matter which disturbs me?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Surely.

Mr. POPE. Let me say that I am very deeply interested in any suggestion to take this whole subject out of politics. I realize that one who advocates that course is on solid ground.

Let us suppose, however, that the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan were adopted. Would not State legislation be required to give somebody within the State power to appoint the board to which the Senator refers? I know that such necessity existed with reference to the social-security legislation, and it took 2 or 3 or 4 years to have the necessary State statutes passed.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let me interrupt the Senator at this point to say that he has put his finger precisely on an unanswered question, so far as my substitute is concerned.

I fully realize that the point the Senator now raises is a pertinent one, and that textually the substitute does not meet it. Let me state to the Senator my theory of procedure.

I have no notion that my substitute, as drawn, is adequate in many of its phases. I am offering it solely as a means to test the sentiment regarding a general principle. If the Senate, unexpectedly—and it would be most unexpectedly—should adopt the substitute, I should say the appropriate course would be immediately to recommit the bill, so that the theory and principle of the substitute could then be adequately and safely developed by the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. POPE. Would it be possible for State legislatures to pass the necessary legislation to put into effect the Senator's proposal, or any similar proposal, in time for those who need relief to receive it? In other words, would not that procedure absolutely stop relief, so that the needy people could not obtain it because of the lack of machinery?

Mr. VANDENBERG. No; I do not think so. I think it would be possible to authorize the Governor to create emergency machinery.

EXHIBIT A

DETROIT AND WAYNE COUNTY FEDERATION OF LABOR,

May 23, 1938.

DEAR SIR: It has been repeatedly announced by Governor Frank Murphy and others that the national administration has given unlimited authorization to place everyone in Michigan to work that needs work, through the W. P. A. Up to the present time, with the exception of a favored few, the W. P. A. administrators in Michigan have refused to accept for W. P. A. employment anyone except those who are first placed on welfare and then transferred to the W. P. A.

Many thousands of worthy citizens have battled for the past 6 or 8 years to keep off the welfare. They do not want the dole; they are trying to keep their names clear from having accepted charity; they want work and in this group will be found most of the skilled mechanics of this community who are now unemployed.

Louis J. Nims, State director of W. P. A., and his assistant, Max Barton, Wayne County director of W. P. A., have insisted on a policy of refusing to accept on W. P. A. for employment anyone unless they are first placed on relief. This has resulted in a discrimination against many thousands of decent citizens in this community. It has also resulted in placing on work as skilled mechanics men who are unfit by training for this work. It is depriving those trained through regular channels of an opportunity to work at their trade. It is training new men to take their place and it is depriving the people and merchants of this community of funds set up by the Federal Government for relief of unemployed while forcing the State and cities to carry on welfare some 70,000 people who could and should be transferred to W. P. A. and many thousands of men who want work on W. P. A. but can't get on without first taking the pauper's oath.

We ask: Are you going to stand for this?

The only contact the people of this community have with the Federal Government is through their Congressmen and Senators.

We demand in the name of decency and fair treatment that the thousands of abandoned mechanics who are now being discriminated against by Nims and Barton be accorded a fair treatment and an opportunity for employment on W. P. A. in accord with the intent of Congress when the appropriation was made and the law passed.

This organization has stood squarely behind the President in his administration. There is only one way to properly remedy this condition and that is to remove Nims and Barton from being in charge of W. P. A. in Michigan and place someone in charge of the administration of W. P. A. in Michigan who will be interested in a proper administration of W. P. A.

Can we count on your help in our efforts to bring relief in the form of honest employment for the thousands of skilled mechanics who are now being deprived of work on the W. P. A.?

Very truly yours,

DETROIT AND WAYNE COUNTY FEDERATION OF LABOR,
FRANK X. MARTEL, President.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I listened with great interest to what the Senator from Michigan said about the needs of the country. He said he had a telegram or some message from his State. I have had one from mine. It reads as follows:

MY DEAR SENATOR COPELAND: You must know Chemung County and Elmira are in bad shape. An agent of the Phoenix Insurance Co. made a canvass and reported we were the worst hit. All the factories discharged most of the workers. Unemployment on every side. Men walking the streets look for a job. What can we do? Isn't there some way we can make Congress act? Will writing Senators or Congressmen do any good? To whom should the voters write? Any suggestions? Thanking you.

This letter is from an old doctor friend of mine in that section of the State. He signs himself as a "taxpayer here for more than 50 years."

I doubt if there is the slightest difference of opinion on this floor as to the necessity of appropriations for relief. I have no doubt of it, and I desire such appropriations to be made. I frankly confess, however, that I am not satisfied with the use which has been made, or alleged to have been made, of funds heretofore appropriated for relief purposes. No matter how much effort is made to explain away or to cast doubt or question upon charges that such funds or the workers em-

ployed under those funds have been exploited for political purposes, I have no doubt that such things have happened.

Last summer I was an alleged candidate for mayor of New York City. I know the people of New York City as well as any man living there. I had private visits from W. P. A. workers and many conferences with those who are employed. They expressed their fear that if they voted for me there would be reprisals.

I am not here to say that their fear was well founded. I could not prove it in every instance; but I know that in order to obtain the benefits of relief in New York it was necessary to go through a certain organization and to obtain the approval of that organization. Without enlarging upon that subject, I wish to say, so far as I am concerned, that I am determined to do everything I can with honor to earmark the funds appropriated by this joint resolution in order that they may be so expended that the relief which we seek shall be afforded, and at the same time that any use of the funds for political purposes shall be prohibited.

To me, all persons in want look alike. I do not care whether they are Republicans, Democrats, Farmer-Laborites, greenbackers, or prohibitionists. I do not care what the political complexion of a given individual may be. I am determined, so far as I can do it, to make sure that suffering people shall not be exploited for political reasons. I do not want human misery made the football of politics.

For the reasons which I have indicated, I desire to have the funds earmarked so far as may be. I am not asking at this moment that there shall be any reduction in the amount of money appropriated; but I am asking that the funds shall be used as the Congress of the United States determines they ought to be used, and that no group or individual shall determine how the money is to be spent. If any allocation of funds is to be made, it should be made by the Congress. Our authority and our constitutional right should not be delegated to another or to others.

I had intended to speak at considerable length this afternoon, but the Senator from Michigan—and I do not resent it, of course—saw fit to enter the discussion. Therefore, I shall satisfy myself for the present by offering an amendment. Let me say to the clerk that I shall send to the desk a corrected copy. I find that some errors have crept into it. I desire to offer an amendment on page 22 of the bill, at the end of the second line, as follows:

Provided, That of the above sum, \$80,000,000—

Subject to some correction—

shall be allotted by the Secretary of War for construction at military posts and stations, in priorities previously established by the Secretary of War, as follows:

Then the amendment lists the places at which the Secretary of War has determined that necessity exists for military housing. This plan, if adopted by the Congress, would result in the expenditure of money in certain quarters where money should be expended. These projects are so widely scattered that practically every State in the Union would be benefited. At the same time I may say that in completing these projects we would have exactly the same amount of relief. Needy citizens would be engaged on these projects, they would be paid wages for their work, and would be given the relief to which they are entitled. Yet the designation is so specific that we would be certain that the money would be spent for the given purpose and not used for any political purpose.

I ask consent, Mr. President, that this amendment may be printed and lie on the table, and that the amendment in full may be included in the body of the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. COPELAND to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 679) to make an appropriation for work relief, relief, and otherwise to increase employment by providing loans and grants for public-works projects, viz:

On page 22, line 2, before the period, insert the following: "*Provided, That of the above sum \$80,801,248 shall be allotted to the Secretary of War for construction at military posts and*

stations in priorities previously established by the Secretary of War, as follows:

"Fort Lewis, Wash., barracks, quarters for officers and noncommissioned officers, warehouse, garage, utilities, and addition to hospital, sufficient to house the Fifteenth Infantry, \$2,689,240.

"Fort Bragg, N. C., barracks, \$413,500.

"Fort Riley, Kans., academic building (this releases two barracks), \$405,000.

"Fort Monroe, Va., barracks, \$335,000.

"Fort Humphreys, near District of Columbia, reproduction plant and heating plant, \$144,880.

"Fort Knox, Ky., barracks, quarters for officers and noncommissioned officers, \$2,899,200.

"Fort Crook, Nebr., barracks, \$193,000.

"Carlisle Barracks, Pa., noncommissioned officers' quarters, school building, warehouse, fire and guard house, \$894,800.

"Fort Monmouth, N. J., barracks and Signal Corps laboratory, \$377,500.

"Madison Barracks, N. Y., barracks, noncommissioned officers' quarters, and water supply, \$359,500.

"Fort DuPont, Del., barracks, \$413,500.

"Savanna Ordnance Depot, Ill., magazines and accessories, \$1,023,413.

"Chanute Field, Ill., school building, hangars, and grading, \$1,412,622.

"Fort Bliss, Tex., barracks, noncommissioned officers' quarters, and radio station, \$463,000.

"Fort Washington, Md., officers' quarters, \$30,000.

"Fort MacArthur, Calif., barracks, \$138,500.

"Fort Myer, Va., barracks and addition to hospital, \$284,500.

"Fort Ethan Allen, Vt., noncommissioned officers' quarters, \$257,500.

"Fort Thomas, Ky., barracks, \$415,000.

"Fort Sam Houston, Tex., barracks, addition to hospital, and basement in transmitter building, \$1,533,700.

"Fort Douglas, Utah, medical detachment barracks, \$42,000.

"Jefferson Barracks, Mo., barracks, addition to barracks, and nurses' quarters, \$205,500.

"Fort Devens, Mass., barracks, officers', noncommissioned officers' quarters, water towers, and telephone construction (sufficient to house additional battalion and make available space at another post for antiaircraft battalion), \$992,800.

"Fort Leavenworth, Kans., auditorium and reproduction plant, \$600,000.

"Fitzsimons General Hospital, Colorado (to this should be added \$1,250,000 as a veteran building share for construction of this hospital, making a grand total of \$3,020,000), \$1,770,000.

"Chanute Field, Ill., barracks, hospital, and warehouses, \$1,464,900.

"Air Corps Technical School, Denver, Colo., ground construction of runways, lighting and bombing facilities, gas storage, warehouse, \$815,900.

"McChord Field, Wash., barracks, hangars, warehouses, and central heating plant, additional system, \$2,494,850.

"Fort Sill, Okla., barracks and addition to, \$1,238,700.

"Ogden Ordnance Depot, Utah, magazine building and appurtenances, \$1,229,369.

"Delaware Ordnance Depot, N. J., magazines and rail facilities, \$504,000.

"Fort Mason, Calif., warehouse, \$1,360,000.

"Presidio of San Francisco, Calif., barracks, noncommissioned officers' quarters, \$593,870.

"Fort McPherson, Ga., radio station and dental clinic, \$108,000.

"Fort Huachuca, Ariz., barracks and hospital, \$500,500.

"Carlisle Barracks, Pa., sterilizing plant and officers' quarters, \$384,500.

"Fort Sheridan, Ill., barracks and noncommissioned officers' quarters, \$656,900.

"Fort Bliss, Tex., stable, stable guards' quarters, and shops, \$473,400.

"Fort Snelling, Minn., barracks and telephone exchange, \$145,340.

"Fort Riley, Kans., noncommissioned officers' quarters, \$275,520.

"Fort MacArthur, Calif., barracks, \$276,000.

"Fort McDowell, Calif., barracks, \$687,500.

"Fort Barrancas, Fla., barracks, \$276,000.

"Fort Bragg, N. C., officers', bachelor officers', nurses' quarters and telephone exchange, \$689,250.

"Fort George G. Meade, Md., barracks and cooks' school, \$963,000.

"Fort Douglas, Utah, barracks, \$300,000.

"Fort Benjamin Harrison, Ind., barracks, noncommissioned officers' and nurses' quarters, \$736,460.

"Jeffersonville Quartermaster Depot, Ind., barracks, \$175,000.

"Jefferson Barracks, Mo., officers' and noncommissioned officers' quarters, \$154,200.

"Holabird Quartermaster Depot, Md., barracks, \$638,250.

"Presidio of San Francisco, Calif., barracks and cooks' school, commissary, warehouse, and noncommissioned officers' quarters, \$582,470.

"Fort Slocum, N. Y., barracks, \$521,600.

"Fort Benning, Ga., barracks and fire station, \$191,300.

"Fort Crockett, Tex., barracks and noncommissioned officers' quarters, \$772,320.

"Fort Ethan Allen, Vt., motorization housing, \$165,700.

"Fort Hoyle, Md., barracks and noncommissioned officers' quarters, \$839,600.

"Edgewood Arsenal, Md., officers' quarters, \$309,600.

"McChord Field, Wash., barracks, officers' and noncommissioned officers' quarters, warehouse, and communications, \$1,346,500.

"Chanute Field, Ill., officers' and noncommissioned officers' quarters, warehousing, and sewerage system, \$591,900.

"Air Corps Technical School, Denver, Colo., hangar and gas and oil storage, \$388,780.

"Holabird Quartermaster Depot, Md., officers' and noncommissioned officers' quarters, \$326,560.

"Fort Knox, Ky., motor shops, nurses' quarters, children's school, and ordnance shop addition, \$445,700.

"Fort Lewis, Wash., noncommissioned officers' quarters, \$314,880.

"Fort Logan, Colo., garage, repair shop, and noncommissioned officers' quarters, \$189,250.

"Savanna Ordnance Depot, Ill., magazines and appurtenances, \$780,000.

"Fort MacArthur, Calif., shops, gas storage, and noncommissioned officers' quarters, \$344,650.

"Fort Sill, Okla., barracks, noncommissioned officers' quarters, and addition to nurses' quarters, \$719,875.

"Aberdeen Proving Ground, Md., barracks, noncommissioned officers' quarters, and ordnance school building, \$846,940.

"Raritan Arsenal, N. J., barracks, \$158,100.

"Fort Clark, Tex., sewage-disposal plant and garage, \$82,300.

"Vancouver Barracks, Wash., noncommissioned officers' quarters, \$147,680.

"Fort Bliss, Tex., bachelor officers' quarters, \$128,800.

"West Point, N. Y. (Stewart Field), hangar, shop, and incidental buildings, \$270,000.

"Camp Dix, N. J., water supply, \$100,000.

"Fort Monmouth, N. J., school for officers and enlisted men, \$296,700.

"Delaware Ordnance Depot, N. J., barracks and dispensary, officers' and noncommissioned officers' quarters, \$265,500.

"Fort Devens, Mass., noncommissioned officers' quarters and garage, \$186,060.

"Fort Hancock, N. J., addition to barracks, noncommissioned officers' and officers' quarters, \$262,000.

"Fort Huachuca, Ariz., motorization housing, warrant officers' quarters, gas and oil storage, \$83,071.

"Jefferson Barracks, Mo., incinerator, gun shed and shops, \$102,500.

"Fort Jay, N. Y., barracks and noncommissioned officers' quarters, \$1,135,700.

"Fort Brady, Mich., barracks, \$300,000.

"Madison Barracks, N. Y., hospital alteration, garage, and shops, \$315,600.

"Fort Moultrie, S. C., warehouse and commissary, \$40,300.

"Fort Myer, Va., warehouse, magazine, fire station, and receiving station (Battery Cove), \$129,745.

"New Cumberland General Depot, Pa., officers' and noncommissioned officers' quarters, \$54,360.

"Plattsburg Barracks, N. Y., shop and hospital modernization, \$238,000.

"Schenectady General Depot, N. Y., officers' and noncommissioned officers' quarters, \$68,650.

"Kelly Field, Tex., officers' and noncommissioned officers' quarters, warehouses, hospital, \$682,800.

"McChord Field, Wash., headquarters, administration building, and gas storage, \$160,200.

"Air Corps Technical School, Denver, Colo., officers' and noncommissioned officers' quarters, magazines, machine-gun range, and railroad, \$423,600.

"Air Corps airways program, buildings and grounds at various minor stations, \$522,900.

"Sacramento Air Depot, Calif., dock, \$75,000.

"Randolph Field, Tex., cadet barracks, \$350,000.

"Patterson Field, Ohio, hangar, barracks, hospital, and equipment repair building, \$1,265,000.

"Duncan Field, Tex., equipment, repair, and engine-test building, \$335,000.

"Mitchel Field, N. Y., completion of runways, \$400,000.

"Maxwell Field, Ala., completion of runways, \$300,000.

"March Field, Calif., completion of runways, \$210,000.

"Fort Sheridan, Ill., noncommissioned officers' quarters, \$157,440.

"Fort Slocum, N. Y., noncommissioned officers' quarters, freight shed, and pier (Neptune dock), \$197,350.

"Fort Huachuca, Ariz., water supply reconstruction, \$161,000.

"Fort Sill, Okla., addition to hospital and construction and improvement of concurrent camp, \$628,000.

"Fort Monroe, Va., hospital modernization, \$422,000.

"Fort Missoula, Mont., addition to barracks, fire station, and guardhouse, including \$79,880 for purchase of materials for other construction, \$308,880.

"Fort Benning, Ga., cooks' school and barracks, and warehouse depot, \$1,019,100.

"Fort Reno, Okla., barracks, \$175,000.

"Fort Leavenworth, Kans., apartment building and school for children, \$1,368,000.

"Fort Des Moines, Iowa, hospital reconstruction, \$111,000.

"Fort Hoyle, Md., barracks, \$692,000.

"Edgewood Arsenal, Md., bachelor officers' quarters, \$216,000.

"Letterman General Hospital, Calif., hospital wards, \$345,800.

"Presidio of Monterey, Calif., hospital, \$300,000.

"Fort Belvoir, Va., garages and shops, \$347,100.

"Fort Story, Va., water tower, \$20,600.

"Fort Totten, N. Y., motor park, \$304,000.

"Fort D. A. Russell, Tex., motor shop, truck and gun shed, \$77,818.

"Fort Niagara, N. Y., barracks, \$324,000.

"Fort Belvoir, Va., barracks, noncommissioned officers, officers' quarters, and shops, \$1,159,200.

"Fort Sheridan, Ill., hospital, school for cooks, motor housing, \$1,229,800.

"Camp Dix, N. J., barracks, officers' and noncommissioned officers' quarters, warehouses, and utilities, \$1,100,000.

"Plattsburg Barracks, N. Y., officers' noncommissioned officers' quarters and barracks, \$862,000.

"Presidio of San Francisco, Calif., officers' quarters, \$474,000.

"Fort Clark, Tex., rehabilitation, \$500,000.

"Scott Field, Ill., barracks, quarters, utilities, runways, warehouses, hangars, and shops, \$4,472,450.

"Hamilton Field, Calif., runways and night lighting, \$380,000.

"Barksdale Field, La., runways, \$660,000.

"Selfridge Field, Mich., runways and night lighting, \$817,500.

"Navigation aids at various stations, \$300,000.

"Wright Field, Ohio, runways, \$660,000.

"Muroc Lake, Calif., barracks, storage, navigation facilities, \$353,500.

"Bolling Field, near District of Columbia, barracks, heating plant, hangar, and miscellaneous buildings, \$1,066,000.

"March Field, Calif., barracks, \$330,000.

"Langley Field, Va., barracks, \$440,000.

"Fort Wayne, Mich., noncommissioned officers' quarters, \$68,000.

"Frankford Arsenal, Pa., office building and extension to building, \$255,000.

"Fort Francis E. Warren, Wyo., barracks, medical detachment, and gymnasium, \$277,500.

"Camp Joseph T. Robinson, Ark., barracks, quarters, and technical facilities to quarter one battalion, antiaircraft artillery, \$3,240,100.

"Fort Ontario, N. Y., noncommissioned officers' quarters, barracks, and warehouse, \$298,875.

"Philadelphia Quartermaster Depot, Pennsylvania, administration building and warehouse, \$480,000.

"Army medical library and museum, District of Columbia, building, with the utilities, accessories, and appurtenances thereto, \$3,750,000.

"Total, \$84,551,248.

"Provided further, That the military reservations of Bolling Field and Fort Humphreys, situated within the District of Columbia, are exempted from the general provisions of this subsection as to such location."

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I should like to say more about this proposal, but I will do that on another occasion. I am to preside at a conference committee meeting at 2 o'clock, and I must leave the floor on that account, but at another time I shall discuss this matter and also another amendment or two which I have to offer, and shall go somewhat into detail regarding the amendment which I presented here 2 days ago providing for river and harbor and flood-control projects.

In closing, let me say that I am not standing here to dispute the necessity of large expenditures by the Government to meet present distressing conditions. In my great community, New York City, with its population of 7,000,000, we know as much about poverty all the time as can the citizens of any other community know. Those of us who live there and are cognizant of present conditions know that never before in our history was there such distress as exists there today. Therefore, I shall gladly support a measure, if properly formulated, to provide the money necessary to carry on the affairs of our country until we may have recovery.

Mr. President, I cannot resist saying just one further word. There is an item in this bill providing for \$75,000,000 for the National Youth Administration. No other class of our people have been so badly hit by the economic conditions of the present day as have the boys and girls, the young men, and the young women. What encouragement or opportunity is afforded them? There is no opportunity today for the graduate of the high school or the college. Where is he or she going to find work? Where are they going to find any opportunity to expend their energies? We must preserve the youth of our Nation. So that one particular item in the bill is one which appeals to me, perhaps, more than all the others. At the proper time I shall enlarge upon this theme and submit more in detail the views I hold regarding other features of the bill.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House

insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 3845) to create a Civil Aeronautics Authority, and to promote the development and safety and to provide for the regulation of civil aeronautics, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. LEA, Mr. CROSSER, Mr. BULWINKLE, Mr. EICHER, Mr. HOLMES, and Mr. WADSWORTH were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

RELIEF AND WORK RELIEF APPROPRIATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 679) making appropriations for work relief, relief, and otherwise to increase employment by providing loans and grants for public-works projects.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] to the pending recovery relief joint resolution. I am particularly interested in his substitute for title I of the measure.

There are today, according to the latest figures of the American Federation of Labor, more than 11,200,000 American men and women without jobs. We all agree that these unfortunate victims of the depression must be cared for and I would not reduce the amount appropriated by title I for relief purposes. But I believe the time has come when we might as well face the problem of unemployment and relief in realistic fashion. It looks as if it were a permanent problem, and to meet it adequately will, I believe, require a permanent program.

I never quite have understood the difference between employables and unemployables, except that this difference has been the excuse given for having the so-called employables needing relief entirely cared for by the Federal relief agency. On the other hand, the unemployables are to be cared for locally.

In practice the principal difference between these two classes seems to be that those who receive their relief funds from the administration get an average of \$53 a month, while those who have to depend upon their own home folks for relief average only \$22 a month.

One effect of this differential seems naturally to be that those on relief regard the national administration as more helpful than the local administrations in power. This is not my idea of the measurement of the adequacy of a relief system.

I realize that when the Federal Government stepped into the field of local relief for the unemployed, it was necessary that something be done, and that it be done quickly. Federal administration of local relief, as an emergency measure, was so well justified that I gave it my unqualified support.

But this has been going on long enough now to indicate quite plainly that relief is a permanent problem, as I have already stated. And it will require a permanent program.

That program of relief should be a planned program; it should be financed out of current revenues except in times of dire emergency; and it should be within the abilities of the various units of government to support on a current basis.

I also believe that this permanent program should be administered by the States under Federal regulation rather than partly by Federal administration in every locality and partly by local administrations. In addition to the discriminations already pointed out, this dual administration brings about a costly duplication of administration and administrative personnel. Also it fails to obtain the local responsibility, administratively and financially, that a permanent relief program should have.

I would not be in favor of the Federal Government furnishing the funds for relief and turn the funds over to be administered locally. Such a procedure would encourage extravagance and corruption and competition among local communities and States as to which units could get the most from the Federal Treasury.

But I do contend that it would be better than the present W. P. A. set-up to have the Federal Government make grants in aid to the States and then allow and require the States

to administer the entire relief for unemployed program in the States. We have recognized that principle of joint financing and local administration, under Federal supervision, in a number of fields. It is not necessary to enumerate them to make this point.

I also maintain that this measure should be written in language which will make it certain that the funds distributed by W. P. A. and P. W. A. cannot be used for political purposes. Every item should be definitely earmarked in a manner that will take this huge appropriation completely out of politics.

The so-called Vandenberg amendment to title I of this bill seems to provide a sane, sound, realistic, and workable solution to this feature of the relief problem.

The amendment, as I understand it, provides that a national nonpartisan board shall make the allotment of Federal funds to States on the basis of need. States will be required to match Federal funds to the extent, at least, of 25 percent. Then the relief program in each State will be administered by a nonpartisan board. We will have local responsibility both for financing and administration and incentives for economy, efficiency, and fairness in administering the program.

If I were going to list the apparent advantages of the proposed system over the dual system now in use, I should list them something like this:

First. It will eliminate the present unfair discrimination between the arbitrarily defined "employables" and "unemployables" that gives to one class of those on relief twice—sometimes more than twice—as much as is received by the neighbor next door in the same predicament.

Second. It will eliminate costly duplications and wastes in overhead. Thereby there will be more relief for the same expenditure of money.

Third. It will eliminate divided responsibility—part Federal, part State, part local—in the administration and financing of relief. There still will be a joint responsibility, but that responsibility will be definitely placed in each and every locality.

Fourth. It will enable hard-pressed State and local governmental units to deal equitably and intelligently—they will know what they have to work with—with the relief problem on a long-time basis.

Fifth. Local taxpayers will have a more complete and vivid realization that relief funds not only are received in their communities but also have to be raised in part in their own communities and that they have to be paid. Too many people have a feeling that money from Washington "just happens." That feeling will wreck our Government if it becomes a fixed belief.

Mr. President, I could elaborate upon these points at considerable length, but I have no desire to go over in detail the ground which has been so completely and plainly covered by the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. I do not believe pump priming from the Federal Treasury is a permanent solution of unemployment at all; and I say it is time to be working out a permanent program, not another stop-gap modeled along lines that already have proved to be a failure.

The pump-priming program suggested by the President possibly may produce a temporary improvement in economic activities. I hope it will do so. While it lasts, the second "shot in the arm" always makes the patient feel a little better. But what I do say is that pump priming will not produce a permanent and lasting recovery. If our army of unemployed is to go back to useful work, and if the life-giving stream of wages from industry is to begin to flow once more through the stores and banks of our land, it will have to be brought about largely by private enterprise.

I should like to see the administration cooperate in good faith and wholeheartedly with business. The administration should take the lead in obtaining the cooperation of capital and labor, finance and industry with government. Neither government, nor industry, nor finance, nor labor working alone can force the other elements of our society to

how to a program for the advancement of its own ideas and welfare.

Let me add that as an emergency measure I am supporting, and I believe Congress should approve, the appropriation of some \$200,000,000 proposed to make parity payments on our surplus exportable crops as defined in the new Farm Act.

I do not believe these parity payments should be financed permanently from relief funds. If it were possible to finance them during the coming crop year from a regular taxing program, I should not urge an appropriation for parity payments from relief funds. But growers of wheat, cotton, and, very likely, of corn are faced with an emergency. Commodity loans will not meet that emergency. If the commodity loans are much above world price levels, they automatically shut off exports. On the other hand, if the commodity loans are low enough to allow free export movement to get rid of burdensome surpluses, they threaten to be too low to save our farmers from heavy financial losses that will be ruinous in thousands of instances. But if parity payments, say, of 25 cents a bushel on wheat, could be made to cooperating farmers on their base acreage production, or even on that part of their base acreage production needed for domestic consumption, I believe the wheat growers could be tided through the next season; and I say this would be a good investment for the people of the United States.

Farm income promises, I should say threatens, to be 20 or 25 percent below what it was last year. Millions of jobs in industry depend absolutely upon farm purchasing power.

So I have no hesitation in urging Senators to support the amendment that has been offered to this joint resolution to provide for the parity payments authorized in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

There is more that could be said on this subject also, but I shall not further trespass upon the time of the Senate.

Mr. HOLT obtained the floor.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POPE in the chair). Does the Senator from West Virginia yield for that purpose?

Mr. HOLT. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Dieterich	King	Pepper
Andrews	Donahay	La Follette	Pittman
Austin	Duffy	Lee	Pope
Bankhead	Ellender	Lewis	Radcliffe
Barkley	Frazier	Lodge	Russell
Berry	George	Logan	Schwartz
Bilbo	Gerry	Loneragan	Schwellenbach
Bone	Gibson	Lundeen	Sheppard
Borah	Gillette	McAdoo	Shipstead
Brown, Mich.	Glass	McCarran	Smathers
Brown, N. H.	Green	McGill	Smith
Bulkeley	Guffey	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Bulow	Hale	McNary	Thomas, Utah
Burke	Harrison	Maloney	Townsend
Byrd	Hatch	Miller	Truman
Byrnes	Hayden	Milton	Vandenberg
Capper	Herring	Minton	Van Nuys
Caraway	Hill	Murray	Wagner
Chavez	Hitchcock	Neely	Walsh
Clark	Holt	Norris	Wheeler
Connally	Hughes	Nye	White
Copeland	Johnson, Calif.	O'Mahoney	
Davis	Johnson, Colo.	Overton	

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, I desire to reannounce the absence of certain Senators and the reasons therefor as given by me this morning upon the first roll call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Ninety Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, yesterday while there was a discussion of politics in the Work Progress Administration taking place in the Senate I was not present. I read the Record with a great deal of interest this morning. I wish it might have been possible for me to be present yesterday to participate in that particular debate, but since that was not possible, I desire to discuss the subject. Is there any politics in the W. P. A.; and if there is any politics in the W. P. A., does Harry Hopkins know about it?

Of course, I do not think it is necessary for me to discuss at any length the statement Mr. Hopkins gave out about Iowa, the place he left for more fertile fields. I refer to his statement, that if he were in Iowa he would vote for a certain candidate for the United States Senate. Of course, Mr. Hopkins would like to determine who was to be in the United States Senate from each of the 48 States, because it would make it much easier for Mr. Hopkins to do what he desires and to carry out the great humanitarian work of reelecting those people who do not dispute his will.

It was stated yesterday that there was some politics in the W. P. A. Frankly, there is so much politics in the W. P. A. that every time it moves it oozes out somewhere. It just oozes out every place in the W. P. A. I admit that in the last couple of years they have put a certain protection around it so that politics will not ooze out to public view, as noticeably as it did in the 1936 campaign; but the W. P. A. is filled with politics, and, contrary to the statements which some believe, Harry Hopkins knows about it, Harry Hopkins practices it in the W. P. A.

He can sit back with hypocrisy and say, "Vote as you please." He can give out that statement, but whenever an election is impending in a particular State, and he or some other members of the official family is particularly interested in getting the right fellow elected, why is it that there is a great increase in the number of projects given to that particular State? That has been the case in primary elections this year. Harry Hopkins used projects to try to elect certain men to the United States Senate, and the House, and he knew when he was doing it that the purpose of the approval of those projects was to help a particular individual whom he wanted elected to the Senate or House or to be continued in Congress.

Harry Hopkins says, "Vote as you please; there is no politics in the W. P. A." Yet he plunged headfirst into the Iowa election, and said, "If I were there I would vote for a certain gentleman from that State." That is a good cue, and no matter how dumb politicians may be, they know what is meant. It will be recalled that 2 years ago, when this question of politics came up, Harry Hopkins said, "I cannot be responsible for these dumb politicians." But I do not believe there is a politician in the State of Iowa so dumb that he did not understand what Mr. Hopkins meant when he said to send to the Senate of the United States a certain individual.

There is not a man in this body who does not know that the W. P. A. is going to be used in the State of Indiana to attempt to beat the senior Senator from Indiana (Mr. VAN Nuys) because he was independent and honest enough to vote his convictions. Senators will remember that back during the reorganization fight W. P. A. shoved so many projects down the center aisle of the Senate that it was almost necessary to move some of the Members back. During the Supreme Court fight, if they could not give you a promise of one of the six additional Supreme Court judges, they would build a courthouse in your home town. [Laughter.] It all depends. The difference was that they promised some the judges and others the courthouses. Nevertheless, there is no politics in the W. P. A.—none whatsoever!

A Member of the Senate who wants to believe that can do so. I have no objection to his believing it, but the American people do not believe it.

Right at this time the newspapers are being furnished with information as to a particularly large number of projects, always noting that Senator X, who has voted right, makes the announcement. Of course, I do not believe the newspapers would distort that news, as the junior Senator from Indiana might think they would; nevertheless, I know that announcements of many projects are being sent out over the country. It is said that Podunkville is going to get the leaves raked off the front yard, and some crossroads is going to build a monkey house, as they built for the Senator from Tennessee. [Laughter.]

These projects all means that someone on the pay roll is going to get to work to help a particular Senator and that

particular Senator gets it announced publicly that he says they are going to reindex the court files or are going to drag the river to see if there are any prehistoric rocks in it. [Laughter.]

They have changed a little. In New York in 1935 and 1936 they spent thousands of dollars tracing the history of the safety pin. [Laughter.] Of course, that put people to work. However, they were more interested in the political import of the safety pin to the people of the State of New York than they were in finding out whether King Tut used a safety pin when he went out. [Laughter.] They no doubt found out what happened to the safety pin, where it came from, and all that. There are plenty of deserving, good Democrats who voted right and supported the candidate who also voted right, and we find that those projects in their communities have been approved with a great deal of enthusiasm. Contrast that with those who voted wrong.

I understand that they have even put members of the W. P. A. to work preparing speeches, good speeches to be used in the campaign. Of course, there is no politics in the W. P. A. Harry Hopkins says there is not. But before I conclude I want to discuss two States, and I know all my colleagues will know what States they are.

Hopkins says there is no politics in W. P. A., but if Senator Somebody votes all right on the reorganization bill and Senator Somebody Else votes wrong, Senator Somebody, the first, is going to get to name the W. P. A. administrator in his State, and Senator Somebody Else is going to get something, but it is not going to be assistance. The W. P. A. is used by Harry Hopkins, with his distinct and personal knowledge, to force Members of the United States Senate and Members of the House of Representatives to vote as Harry Hopkins wants them to vote. If Members of this body do not think so, try to buck the W. P. A. Administration and then go down and ask Harry Hopkins about a project. That is the best way to find out about it.

The fair-haired boys down at the W. P. A. are the boys who always "go along." They are the ones who vote right here on the Hill.

Another thing, it is very interesting to note the great increase of need just before primary election time. Just watch the increases in the W. P. A. in States where they have a particular interest in the primary or in the general election.

I shall not cite West Virginia at any length, because I desire to discuss some other States. I think it would be interesting to discuss the State of Pennsylvania a little later on. I have not discussed Pennsylvania, because Harry Hopkins says there is no politics in the W. P. A. and that a dear beloved boss, a Member of this body, would not practice any politics.

Let us now refer to the State of West Virginia. Five weeks before the primary election in my State there were 56,403 employees on the W. P. A. roll.

Five weeks after the primary election there were only 43,457 persons on the W. P. A. roll, a decline of 13,000. Of course, Senators know W. P. A. would not play any politics at all. None whatsoever. Those 13,000 found jobs in 5 weeks' time. W. P. A. would not play politics. But who causes the increase of the allotment of personnel, or the decrease?

Let us look at the following year, 1937, one year after the primary election. That year there were not 56,000 persons on the W. P. A. rolls, but 37,381 persons employed on W. P. A., or a difference of 19,000, because they did not need those 19,000 politically in the State of West Virginia.

If they have any need in the primary this year, of course, they will put the people back on the rolls. At the same time they have taken care of a few of the hungry people. They have given whole mouthfuls into the hungry politicians. They give the hungry individual a crumb, and they give the hungry politicians a whole loaf of bread.

Senator Sorghum, who supports the program, announces to his people back home that he has gotten a project in his

State to take care of the hungry people in a particular community.

O Mr. President, there is no politics connected with W. P. A. Who O. K.'s the project? Harry Hopkins O. K.'s it, and he knows when he O. K.'s it that it will have particular benefit for a particular Senator or for a particular Representative. Then it is said that if there is politics Harry Hopkins does not know anything in the world about it. If Harry Hopkins is too "dumb," using his own expression, not to know there is politics in the W. P. A., he is not capable to handle 10 cents, let alone the billion of dollars that he has handled as he desires, as he wants, as he thinks should be used to make Senators realize that they ought to vote "right."

So it is we find that in all these things, with these projects, personnel, the whole set-up of the W. P. A. is used by certain Senators and Representatives, and when both Representatives and Senators are in bad the projects are usually given to the Governor if he is satisfactory. It just depends upon whether one Senator is good and one is bad. The good Senator gets the project, and the bad Senator gets it in the neck. [Laughter.]

Probably Harry Hopkins' organization announces that Representative WEARN, of Iowa, whom he must know well, had received W. P. A. projects for Iowa. Was that because Mr. GILLETTE was against the Supreme Court bill?

I know I have been criticized because I am a Democrat and because I opposed the use of the W. P. A. by cheap Democrats in order to starve people into submission to make them accept political ideas. I shall continue to expose such use. I shall continue so long as I have breath in my body to point out a wrong wherever I find it.

I should like to place in the RECORD what President Roosevelt said in 1932 about our political racketeers, when he told all of us that it would be important that we expose graft and corruption in politics wherever we might find it. I shall not take the time of the Senate to read that statement, but I ask that it be inserted in the RECORD. I agree with him that the wrongs should be exposed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCGILL in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement is as follows:

The root of the racketeers' continued existence in your Government lies in your own complacency. It is shown in the attitude of the citizen who smiles good naturedly over the election of his friend to a local Government position for which he is in no way qualified. This is the first step toward condoning the giving of contracts to the bosses' friends, or the taking of commissions from the agent who sells equipment.

Real honesty on the part of a public official is attained when he really strives to get 100 cents of results out of every taxpayer's dollar. This honesty can come only by a change of attitude on the part of the public in communities where graft and extravagance exist.

Leadership must educate the public if it expects to get the public response necessary for effective action. Real leadership must drive home the urgency of constant watchfulness at all times, not spasmodically. Leadership must remove partisanship from watchfulness. Leadership must acknowledge that corruption is among men first, last, and all the time, no matter to which political party they belong. Leadership must acknowledge that the party in power is the party with the opportunity to be corrupt. Leadership must re-create a sense of proportion about graft.

In almost every community there are men honest and courageous enough to attack corruption wherever they see it. But their fault and the fault of the press of the Nation is that graft is not large enough to "see" until it has assumed scandalous dimensions.

In communities spending half a million dollars a year, a wastage of \$100,000 through inefficiency and corruption is not often considered a scandal in the eyes of the leaders. But when a great city spends one hundred millions of dollars a year and wastes twenty millions of it annually, certain people are in a frenzy. Yet in proportion the wastage is the same in the first community as in the second.

As soon as the people realize that "a little graft" in a small community is the same as "an odious scandal" in a large community, we will begin to have more honesty and efficiency everywhere.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

Mr. HOLT. Some Senators brand the minority report as a Republican document. I do not care how it is branded. Senators may brand it whatever they wish. The question

is not, Who wrote it? but the question is, Is it the truth? And if it is not the truth, why is it not denied? This is what the minority report says about this measure in "priming the election":

In 1934 there were 2,283,000 more people aided by Federal relief funds in November than in June.

November, as I understand, is the general month in which citizens vote. I think that is right. Of course, it is quite unique that between June and November there were 2,283,000 more persons added to the relief rolls.

In 1936, also an election year, we find that between July and November there was an increase of 1,213,000 persons on relief.

The old political calculation is that every person added to the pay roll means five more voters. I do not blame the Members of the Congress who feel that they would like to stay in the Senate and in the House for taking that into consideration. I know they do. Some of them may not admit it, but nevertheless it is the case.

Here is a very interesting thing. In 1934 there was an increase. In 1936 there was an increase.

Let us now look at 1933 and 1935 and 1937 which were not election years. Let us see whether there was an increase. We find that in 1933 there was a decrease between June and November of 3,243,000 persons, whereas in 1934 there was an increase of 2,283,000 persons on relief rolls, according to this report.

Mr. President, the W. P. A. officials felt that people have short memories, and so long as they were on the W. P. A. projects at election time Representative WEARN could get the support in Iowa, and whoever runs against Senator VAN NUYS will get the support in Indiana, and whoever opposes that distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] will also get the support of the W. P. A. Do not be fooled about that one bit.

But in 1935, between the months of June and November, there was a decrease of 3,165,000 persons. They did not need them. That was not an election year.

In 1934 and 1936 the numbers on the relief rolls were increased, and in 1935 and 1937 the numbers on relief rolls were decreased.

Harry would not play any politics with relief. Those 3,000,000 people found jobs overnight just as soon as the election returns were counted.

Let us look at the report as to 1937. We find that between June and November 1937 there was a decrease of 2,648,000 persons on the relief rolls. As I said before, in 1936 there had been an increase in the persons on the relief rolls during the same period of the year.

According to this report, at the very same time that they were increasing the number of persons on the rolls, the index of business activity was also increasing, not as the result of the W. P. A. but as the result of poll priming that they wanted in this particular election.

You know and I know that this money is going to be spent as a political fund, and out of the Treasury of the United States there will be paid the campaign funds of those Senators who vote as the administration tells them to vote. The tragedy is that they do it under the sugar-coating of taking care of the hungry and unfortunate citizens. It depends upon who you are for whether you are hungry or not, and to the W. P. A. it depends upon who you support politically whether or not you need clothes. If you are an administration supporter they will not put you on with relief status; they will put you on as a boss. In one project that I investigated in the State of West Virginia, a road project, six engineers were employed. Of course those men were needed as engineers on that road, and I imagine every one of those engineers was for the ticket in the fall.

I am quoting from a story dated April 29 concerning Harry Hopkins. The newspaper article says:

In response to questions Hopkins said he could not say anything now about the merits of charges by one politician against another, but added this—

Here is what the great Harry Hopkins said. He was not going to have politicians get the best of him:

I don't intend to let these babies operate on me.

That is Harry Hopkins speaking—

I don't intend to let these babies operate on me.

Oh, let one of these politicians start to be against him and he will operate on the politician, do not be fooled about that. [Laughter in the galleries.]

Into this operating room are brought only those who have political diseases that he can detect.

I see my distinguished and good friend from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is present in the Chamber, and although this suggests a side line, I might quote from the same article as to what Harry Hopkins said about the Senator's report.

Hopkins dismissed the charges of waste and extravagance in W. P. A. made in the minority report of the Senate committee investigating unemployment and relief with these words, "I think it's nuts." [Laughter.]

Mr. LODGE. But he did not disprove any of the facts.

Mr. HOLT. No. I have not heard of any dispute of those facts, but he still thinks "it's nuts."

We need another W. P. A. Director. Of course, I know that my word will not be heeded at the White House with respect to Hopkins' dismissal. I am not being fooled into believing that just because I ask that Harry Hopkins go he will go. Instead, he will probably get a raise in salary. [Laughter.]

I never try to fool myself. I try to be practical about it. I think this speech will do a lot of good in West Virginia, because every time I deliver a speech on the W. P. A. a few more hundred are added to the W. P. A. forces in West Virginia. If I speak long enough and often enough, there ought to be as many employed in 1938, when we do not elect a Senator, as there were in 1936, when one was elected.

Talking about other matters, I think the Senate wants specific examples. I want to discuss the great Keystone State of Pennsylvania.

In an article in the Saturday Evening Post, which to my knowledge has never been denied, there is a story about the spoils system. I quote from that article:

At present the Pennsylvania W. P. A. has only 6,000 nonrelief workers and few more than 2,000 administrative employers, as already stated. But in the all-important year 1936 its nonrelief workers were many more than 10,000 and its administrative employees numbered about 3,000. None of these jobs have required advance certification of need. In the Jones W. P. A. they have required another kind of certification—clearance from the Guffey organization.

Perhaps I should explain who Jones is. Jones used to be a director of the W. P. A. in Pennsylvania. He now edits a paper called Economic Security, which was used in the recent election in Pennsylvania, about which election Senators may have heard. Eddie Jones possesses the absolute support of the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY]. This is what the Senator from Pennsylvania is reported to have said about Jones and the W. P. A.:

I just put in Eddie Jones and left the rest to him.

But let me get back to the article:

Relief officials and some Pennsylvania politicians piously deny this, but Joe's more truthful henchmen are frank in admitting it. As Bailey once remarked, "Those are designated jobs. If good Democrats can have them, why shouldn't they? Hell's bells!"

I am quoting from the article. I do not use that language myself, except when talking about the W. P. A.

To go ahead with the article:

Jones has left the W. P. A., and is now exercising his publicizing talents for Lieutenant Governor Kennedy, the Lewisite labor candidate for the governorship.

May I digress long enough to say that Kennedy was a candidate in the Pennsylvania election.

Let me go ahead with the article:

But Jones has been succeeded by J. Banks Hudson, a Jones alter ego trained in Jones' methods. And even today, with the national election long over, anyone whose travels take him near the Pennsyl-

vania W. P. A. knows that it stinks as insistently of politics as a 10-day dead whale on a beach stinks of whale.

That is pretty bad.

The tone of its administration was admirably expressed early in its history, in Jones' own presence, by John F. Laboon, a Jones district administrator.

This is quoting Mr. Laboon. I do not know who Mr. Laboon is, but this is quoting him:

"Any W. P. A. worker who is not in sympathy with the W. P. A. program and the Roosevelt administration," bellowed Mr. Laboon to a Pittsburgh meeting of W. P. A. foremen and supervisors, "will be eliminated from the W. P. A. pay rolls in this district as quickly as I can act. I want you men to report all such cases to me without delay."

An election was held recently in Pennsylvania. I quote from the Pittsburgh Press of Sunday, April 24, 1938. This is the headline:

GUFFEY aides see W. P. A. men. Workers charge "squeeze" put on relief rolls.

I quote from the article:

Despite threats of a Federal investigation of charges that Works Progress Administration forces were being lined up for the C. I. O.-Guffey ticket in the Pennsylvania primary, supervisors and foremen in Allegheny County yesterday were summoned to Hotel Henry, headquarters of the ticket.

It brought the first clear-cut charge that a "squeeze" was being tried, that W. P. A. rolls were to be "maced" for votes, and that United States Senator JOSEPH F. GUFFEY's swing to the John L. Lewis forces was not an idle gesture.

There is no politics in the "squeeze."

Upward of 75 men, all either supervisors or foremen of the Works Progress Administration, received "invitations" during the week to see Frank Dixon, chairman of the "Veterans Division," Kennedy Campaign Committee of Allegheny County.

More than a score responded, many of them not veterans, for the cards were sent to virtually all division heads of the W. P. A.

Most of them were ushered into a conference room with Mr. Dixon one at a time. Many declined to discuss what went on behind the closed doors. Others told of the conversation.

One said he was sent word last week that he must let 20 men go because they were wearing "Jones for Governor" buttons.

Think of that. "Because they were wearing 'Jones-for-Governor' buttons."

The word meant, he said, that none of the W. P. A. workers were to support Charles Alvin Jones for Governor. Mr. Jones is the slated Democratic candidate.

"When I went in to Kennedy headquarters at the Henry Hotel, I told Mr. Dixon that I came regarding the card that was sent me," he said.

"I hear you have been working against us," the W. P. A. worker quoted Mr. Dixon with replying.

"Well, I haven't done anything against you on the job," the worker said he replied, "but I have been working in the town."

"Were you at the North Side meeting?" Mr. Dixon was said to have asked. "You saw Kesner (James E. Kesner, Allegheny County W. P. A. director) and Art Bender there, didn't you?"

"Yes," the W. P. A. worker replied, "but I thought we were to remain neutral in the W. P. A.," the worker answered.

Poor fellow! He will be unemployed. Do not worry about that. He is one of the dumb politicians who does not understand.

"Kesner and Bender's presence at the meeting should have been a 'tip-off' for you," Mr. Dixon replied.

The W. P. A. foreman then told Mr. Dixon that he had been informed that he would be transferred or dismissed because of working for Jones.

"That is only rumors, I do not know," Mr. Dixon was said to have replied. "You can make peace yet."

In other words, "you can make a mistake, but if you make peace with us we will get you back on the W. P. A. pay roll. Of course, if you make peace with JOE GUFFEY's organization, you might even get to be a foreman."

I suppose he told him that. That is not in the article.

I said a moment ago that the W. P. A. worker might be dumb. He must not have been dumb, because here is the question he asked:

"What if Jones and Earle win?" the W. P. A. worker asked.

That was a logical question. He was working for them.

"You know JOE GUFFEY will be in for 2 more years; he will take care of things," Mr. Dixon said.

Any person who says there is politics in W. P. A. is disputing Mr. Hopkins' word. Mr. Hopkins cooes politics wherever he goes.

I am sure I want to be fair to my colleague, so I am going to quote what he says about politics in the W. P. A. I quote from the Pittsburgh Press of Saturday, April 23. This is what the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] said when they asked him if he had anything to do with the W. P. A. in politics:

"Let them try to prove it," he said, when informed that Mr. Kelly had asked the President to send G-men to Harrisburg to investigate his charges of W. P. A. coercion. "I am opposed to political use of W. P. A. and have never interfered with its administration."

Senators may believe that if they wish. In all fairness to the Senator, I thought I ought to quote it. He and Mr. Hopkins do not believe in using politics in the W. P. A. in the State of Pennsylvania.

The workers were sent a magazine, known as "Economic Security." That sounds fine. That means that you are going to get something. It was published by the Nored Corporation, and the address, according to this paper, is 1835 Third Street, Harrisburg. This paper tells us what "Nored" means.

My colleague said he was going to leave everything to Eddie Jones. Eddie was the publisher of this paper. His name is Edward Noel Jones. He is a former W. P. A. administrator in Pennsylvania, appointed by Hopkins. So they took the "No" from his name. That is where they got the first part of the name.

It may be wondered where they got the "red" from. We find that his wife's name was Penelope Redd. Penelope Redd was the wife of Mr. Edward Noel Jones, so they took the "No" from "Noel" and the "red" from "Redd" and got the "Nored" Corporation. We find that the Nored Corporation published a magazine which was to be circulated among the W. P. A. workers in the State of Pennsylvania. It was to be circulated free if the workers would read it, and the publishers were to get a dollar if they could. It all depended on whether or not they could get the dollar. If they thought they could get a dollar, you subscribed, and if you did not subscribe, you could still receive Economic Security.

Nevertheless, they passed out copies of this so-called Economic Security in the State of Pennsylvania to W. P. A. workers. In this publication there was a signed article by J. Banks Hudson. Who is J. Banks Hudson? He is the W. P. A. administrator for the State of Pennsylvania, and in this Economic Security we find that J. Banks Hudson tells them all about W. P. A. Then right over here [indicating] is an advertisement about the distinguished Senator who gets all these relief jobs, and all these relief appropriations in the Senate. The purpose is to convince them they need him in the Senate. The President also has said, "I need Joe in the United States Senate." But, nevertheless, we find that in connection with these W. P. A. projects in the State of Pennsylvania there are many interesting developments relative to the use of politics in the W. P. A. I know what is in the minds of some Senators. It is said they fired 10. Yes; they got an unfortunate 10. But whom did they get? Some poor worker who happened to have a job as foreman who was forced to go out and work for the politicians. They never went beyond the foreman. They did not touch the head of the organization; they did not touch the district director. They did not stop JOE GUFFEY from announcing that he was going to have a project for them "up Salt River."

So some poor unfortunate in the State of Pennsylvania who was carrying out orders got caught and lost his job; in fact, there were 10 of them. They disciplined 8 others in Luzerne County which is the county where a family is on the pay roll; 179 relatives on the pay roll. However, I am not discussing nepotism; that is neither here nor there today; I am discussing the fact that in Pennsylvania when the thing came to the front it was not a State W. P. A. director that got fired; it was not JOE GUFFEY who got touched; it was

not any of the district W. P. A. directors at all; but some poor little foreman who did not make peace with the organization and support it. So it is we find that there is no politics.

Now, I should like to refer to an editorial from the Pittsburgh Press entitled "How about GUFFEY?" It states that three W. P. A. foremen in Allegheny County, who were fired, "got it on the chin"; they had to go out and try to find jobs; they are on the unemployment list. They were too dumb to know what to do, and they got caught. They were the so-called "dumb politicians" whom Harry Hopkins talks about. We find that W. P. A. was cleaned up in that manner. The big bosses were not touched.

Here is something from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of April 27, 1938. The headline is, "W. P. A. jobs slip out of Scully's grip." Scully is mayor of Pittsburgh, if any of the Senators do not know. We find that during the recent campaign in Pennsylvania the W. P. A. jobs did slip out of his grip. They found out that some of these fellows were playing politics. Mr. Kesner found that out. He is W. P. A. director for Allegheny County. He found there was some politics there. The papers say he dismissed a number of men, yet during his talk with the reporters, telling about dismissing them, Mr. Kesner was wearing a button of the Kennedy-for-Governor ticket. The reporters may have said to him, "You fired these men for playing politics, yet every day you are meeting these men—I suppose they said if they got into his office—and I see this button for Kennedy on your coat." Reporters ask funny questions sometimes. They asked that question of him, and here is what he said:

I do not consider the wearing of a button a political activity. That is a personal matter with the individual. But when a superintendent or supervisor talks to workers on the job and urges them to support this or that ticket, then I do consider it political activity.

But now let us look to see what happened according to this account. Here is the statement:

Pat Welsh, one of the men transferred by Kesner, had a different explanation: "I was demoted," he said, "because I refused to wear a Kennedy button." Welsh was taken from his \$250-a-month job as general superintendent of the Hill Top and West End division and assigned to a \$180-a-month job at East Deer Township, 40 miles from his Beechview home.

That was an expensive button for Welsh, for they transferred him 40 miles from home and cut \$70 from his salary. Oh, no; there is no politics in W. P. A.

I read further from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette:

June Davin was demoted from superintendent of North Side project to general foreman at Castle Shannon.

They, of course, would not want it to be understood that Mr. Hopkins knew anything in the world about that. He did not know anything about it. It was some of these local politicians trying to play politics. Who appointed J. Hudson Banks? Mr. Hopkins appointed him. Who recommended him? Of course, I am not on the inside, and I cannot say definitely, but I would wager that Mr. J. Banks Hudson, who is W. P. A. director for the State of Pennsylvania, got his job because he was recommended by the junior Senator from Pennsylvania. I cannot say that definitely, because they do not give me any inside information.

But, nevertheless, Mr. J. Banks Hudson is director of W. P. A. there, and he, in turn, appointed Mr. Kesner, who was director of relief for Allegheny County, and he, in turn, appointed others. Who appoints the State organization? The politicians right here in Washington, right here in the United States Senate—that is, if they vote right they appoint them, and if the Senators do not vote right they go over to the other House of Congress and get somebody there to make the recommendation.

There is another thing that I should like to say: I could go further into conditions in the State of Pennsylvania, because Pennsylvania is so rotten and corrupt with W. P. A. politics that even the Kennedy ticket ran a pretty good race up there with W. P. A. support. The same thing is true every place we go; we see the same development of politics in W. P. A. State after State shows it. Yet we hear men

say, "It is local. Harry Hopkins does not know anything about it." What is he doing sitting here in Washington if he does not know anything about it? I am saying that he found out quickly in some States that the candidate who was the loser was playing politics. Here is a funny thing. Wherever they find politics they fake an investigation.

Back in 1936 I said these W. P. A. investigators going into a W. P. A. investigation looked to me like sending "Baby Face" Nelson to investigate Dillinger. I think that is the case, and I think it will be so proven as to the W. P. A. investigators. Who appoints the men who investigate the W. P. A.? Mr. Harry Hopkins. Do you think, Senators, if they would come back here and report that Harry Hopkins was playing politics or that W. P. A. was playing politics that they would hold their jobs very long? No. Whom do we find going into the States to investigate W. P. A.? We find W. P. A. itself. Of course, they do not find anything. Sometimes they wait until the election is over to determine who was wrong. I know of such instances. They wait until the election is over, and then they find that someone did play politics, but the fellow who played politics was the one who got a licking in the election.

Nearly always it is the man who got caught was for the losing man; but the man who was for the winning ticket did not play any politics according to them. Watch the Florida investigation. They will not find that there was any politics down there. Probably they spent enough money in Florida to build a concrete road from Key West, Fla., to San Francisco, I presume, but it will not be shown that there was any politics played in Florida; none whatsoever; was it all done because of great love for the State of Florida? It was the first time in years that Florida got that much money. Nevertheless, I think it will be found that all of the investigations will prove that the men who were on the losing ticket are "playing politics."

I wish to quote something more; and I challenge Mr. Hopkins, or I challenge any Senator on the floor, to dispute these statements if they are not true. You can try to fool the people, but sometime, somehow they are going to find out the truth. Here is a letter which I have in my possession. There is no politics, and yet the administrative assistant of the W. P. A. wrote this:

I hand you herewith a list of doctors in Ohio County. Separate the Democrats from the Republicans and list them in order of priority, so that we may notify our safety foreman and the compensation men as to who is eligible to participate in case of injury.

Oh, no; there is no politics! "Separate the Democrats from the Republicans"; separate the goats from the sheep. I have that letter in my possession; I used it before on the floor of the United States Senate; but I think it worth while to refer to it again, and, therefore, I have done so.

Mr. Hopkins undertook to investigate, and the man he sent to do the investigating is now investigating relief for the United States Senate. Is that not a funny thing? The man who was sent down to West Virginia to whitewash W. P. A. in West Virginia is now a counsel of the committee of the United States Senate investigating relief. But here is another letter—I also have this in my possession—from a W. P. A. director:

The time to correct mistakes is before they are made, if possible.

Listen to that—

The time to correct mistakes is before they are made, if possible. Consequently, we do not want anyone on this job who is not right. These hundreds of applications going on should be taken around to designated—

Listen—

to designated leaders and then be used accordingly.

They are to be taken around "to the designated leaders!" There is no politics at all in this. They just happened to pick that man out of the air to be a "designated leader," to determine whether or not he should correct the mistakes. As they said, "The time to correct mistakes is before they are made, if possible;" so "Get the right boys on, so that

we will not have to fire them and cause a stink." That is what they mean. In other words, "Get the boys on that you are sure of, that will deliver the goods 100 percent, and get the other crowd off."

Now going ahead with the letter, and what they want the designated leaders to do, it says:

Take them to the designated leaders in each county, and sort them. Then the local leaders cannot blame the personnel office if the right boys are not on.

Listen to that!

Take them to the designated leaders, and let them sort them. Then the local leaders cannot blame the personnel office if the right boys are not on. This, to my mind, is paramount if this organization is to accomplish what it has to do in the next year.

Oh, no; you would not think there was any politics at all in the W. P. A.—none whatsoever—but they are going to take the names of the men who are employed on relief, and take them to the "designated leaders," and sort them, so that they will not make any mistakes at election time.

Here is another letter from which I want to quote. This is what was said:

We have earnestly tried to be very broad-minded in permitting the advisers to consult with the party leaders in their respective counties in order that we may be assured—

Listen to this:

We have earnestly tried to be very broad-minded in permitting the advisers to consult with the party leaders in their respective counties in order that we may be assured of complete harmony and support at the next primary and general elections.

I wonder if they had the same kind of consultation in the great Keystone State of Pennsylvania?

Here is another letter from which I am going to quote: I nearly missed this letter. I have so much material that I could talk for many, many hours; and I may talk again later on, because I should like to take up different States. I should like to discuss the Hague machine in the State of my friend from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS]. That would be an interesting one; but I cannot do it today. I have so much material that I cannot get to it; but I want to quote from this letter, which I have in my possession. This is what it says:

I am only aiming to solidify and keep together the Democratic organization. On all appointments made here by Senator ———

You may fill in the blank—

he always checks my office first, and we try to check the ones who are deserving and who we know will be dependable ——— workers.

The blank refers to the same Senator. In other words, "We want to check them to see if they will be good workers."

Now, to make the organization strong, I must still be at the head of it until after the primary.

This man got a little shaky, and thought he was going to be allowed to go, and he said he had to be at the head. In the letter which he wrote to this Senator, he said, "You leave me at the head, because I have to be here until after the primary."

No politics in W. P. A.! Harry Hopkins year after year, playing politics as we have seen in States all over the country, says that there is no relief in the W. P. A., or, rather, no politics in W. P. A. What I started inadvertently to say is the truth. There is not very much relief in the W. P. A. There is more interest in the politics in it than there is relief; and we find that money is spent for bosses instead of for the poor unfortunates who are in need of relief.

Now, let me show you how he does that. He says, "We spend only 5 percent for administration;" but do you know that in the cost of administration he does not count the project supervisors; he does not count the timekeepers? I have heard—I have not checked the statement, but, knowing the W. P. A. as I do, I do not doubt it—that on one project a timekeeper had an entire day to figure out the time of four workers. Those timekeepers are not listed on the W. P. A. administrative pay roll. The foremen are not listed, and therefore the administrative expense is kept under 5 percent.

They said that in the State of West Virginia there were only 410 persons on the administrative pay roll. Back in 1936, when we made an investigation of the W. P. A. in my State, I found that there were 2,235 persons employed in administrative or supervisory capacities. In that group, only 575 were listed as administrative employees, but the other 1,660 were on the pay roll, receiving good wages.

Another thing: It is very interesting to cite these things. Let us go down to the State of Louisiana. Back in the days when the late Huey P. Long was in the United States Senate, check the projects that were given Louisiana. Now, since Louisiana has become converted, check the projects in the State of Louisiana. Check the number on the pay roll, check the projects given, check the money poured into the State of Louisiana, and then determine for yourself whether there is any politics in W. P. A.

Now I want to quote from another State; and I am quoting a letter that has already been made public. I shall not give the name of the State, but you may fill it in. This is a letter which was made public politics in W. P. A. I said last year, when I was speaking here, that in the initials "WPA", the "W" stands for "Waste", the "P" stands for "Politics", the "A" stands for "Administration", and what is left goes to the hungry people.

But let me quote from this letter. It says:

It has become common talk among our people that the State administrator of the Works Progress Administration in — has openly and boldly stated that he and his organization will leave nothing undone to achieve the reelection of —; and, accordingly, every Federal relief agency in — is frankly and brazenly operating upon a political basis. For the first time in our observation, the Works Progress Administration, which was conceived and established to feed the families of the unemployed, irrespective of the politics, race, or creed of those to be served, through its directing heads is seeking to drive hungry and destitute people to vote for a certain candidate for office.

Meetings and conferences have been held in practically every county of the State by key men in places of importance with the Works Progress Administration, at which definite instructions were given to select agents that no one should be placed on Federal relief except upon the advice of —'s campaign managers in the respective counties.

Then the letter goes ahead to say that the employees have been approached for money; and down here farther it says:

Instructions have gone out from the head—

Not from the bottom, but from the head—

of the Works Progress Administration in — that all records pertaining to employment and salaries must be kept confidential and secret. The rank and file of the citizenship are denied the right of knowing how many persons are on the Federal relief pay roll, what salaries are paid, and what duties and responsibilities are imposed upon those employed. Persons are being employed who do no definite work, but they are instructed to spend their entire time in political activity. Practically every Federal project is top-heavy with foremen, part of whom confine their time and attention to keeping certain men definitely in line for —, part of whom spend their time checking up on the loyalty to —; of men already placed on the W. P. A. * * * A tremendous waste of money is the result of this arrangement.

So we find that State after State has shown these particular instances of politics in it. If only one State were pointed out to Harry Hopkins, and then he said, "There is no politics in relief," there might be an excuse for him. How can he sit back and say that Frank Hague is not using the W. P. A. for political purposes in the State of New Jersey?

I read an editorial—I do not know whether there was any verification of it or not, and it says that the W. P. A. spent, in the city of Newark, \$565,000 a mile for roads. You know, they sing about "the golden street." The golden street must be in the city of Newark, if that is true; so we may walk up the golden street of Newark instead of the golden street of the days to come, and the W. P. A. spent the money. Why did they spend that much money? Was it because the vice chairman of the Democratic National Committee might have control of the money, to be used as he desires?

It may interest you, going up now to the State of Massachusetts, I believe, to quote a letter which was made public some time ago. Here is the letter:

DEAR COMMITTEEMAN: Contact all houses in your division and get the names of all men on relief; also of those holding W. P. A. jobs. Urge them to register Democratic on March 26 or else lose their jobs.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES McDONALD.

Of course, there is not any politics in the W. P. A.—none whatsoever!

Here is another one which was made public today, telling about this. It says, speaking about a W. P. A. official:

He asked each employee if they were registered, and, if so, what precinct they were registered from, and what candidate they intended to support in the coming primary.

If you are in this precinct, and a Republican, and hungry, you are not the right person to get relief; but if you are in this district, and are working for the man who voted for the Supreme Court change and voted for the reorganization bill and voted for everything the administration wanted, you will get help.

So we find that in the State of Iowa Harry Hopkins has come out publicly for the first time and done something that he has been doing privately for many, many months. He has played the game with the Members of the Senate who voted as he wanted them to vote. He has played it by allowing them to name the officials, and there is not a Senator present today who does not know, if you let anyone control the organization what effect it will have on the men under the head of the organization.

Why is it that these W. P. A. workers have been taken from their work in order to go to political meetings and hear the favorite candidate of Harry Hopkins in the particular election which might be involved? I could cite an actual record of a case like that. Yet they say that if Harry Hopkins knew about this, he would straighten it out. Yes; he would straighten it out. When did Harry Hopkins ever step on the toes of a man who voted in the United States Senate for bills which the administration wanted? If there is such an instance, I hope that some one present will give me the benefit of a citation to it. If not, why is it that Harry Hopkins does not know that there is politics in relief. The Public Treasury is to be used for a campaign fund in order that men can go back to their congressional seats, whether in this body or in the other?

That is what this money is going to be spent for. I hate to think of it. We need to appropriate money for relief. We need to do it because conditions are bad, even if they "planned it that way." Things are bad in this country. The President said in Charleston, S. C., "We planned it that way, and don't let any one tell you differently." Nevertheless, there is many a person hungry right now, while I am speaking.

We need relief more today than for years, because private industry has been driven to close its doors by policies not based on common sense. Factory doors have been closed. People in the city of Detroit are walking the streets looking for jobs, in the city of Cleveland the people are wanting work, idle are found in the city of Washington. These people need relief. Is it not a pity that the millions and billions we appropriate will not feed more of the hungry because of the politics in the administration, which adds waste and extravagance?

My colleagues realize that I am telling the truth. Many Senators have told me in the cloakroom, "I know you told the truth, but we cannot afford to say that openly." Why cannot a Member of the United States Senate say openly that the W. P. A. is used for political purposes? That is an admission in itself that they know that the W. P. A. is being used for political purposes, and if they open their mouths they will be hit on the head with it.

We can find throughout the country hungry people remaining hungry while politicians are on the pay roll at enormous salaries. Out of this relief fund will come money for the National Emergency Council, part of whose business it is to clip newspapers and tell the administration if they are getting along all right in each of the States of the Union. That is the purpose of the National Emergency Council. It

went out of existence in December, or at least it was to go out of existence, according to an Executive order, but with an election year coming along the President revoked his Executive order, and the N. E. C. is back at work. It will have a lot to do. Let me quote what the director of the N. E. C. said he will have to do. These are not my words. This is his testimony as found on page 612 of the report:

The first half of the fiscal year 1938 and the fiscal year 1939 are not comparable.

Then he tells why the fiscal year 1938 and the fiscal year 1939 are not comparable.

So far as fiscal years are concerned, that period is comparable with 1936 because of the fact that the demands for information during an election year are tremendous compared with demands during an off year.

Oh, no; there is no politics; they are not using the money for that. The demands for information during an election year are so much more important. It was not important to tell the people in 1937, but it is important to give them information in 1938, as it was to increase the number of employees on the relief pay rolls between June and November of election year, and take them off in the years when we did not have elections. I am not going to be a party to it. They may get away with using the Public Treasury to black-jack United States Senators into voting for bills. They may get away with using the Public Treasury to blackjack the Members of the House of Representatives into voting for bills. They may get away with that, but when the American people once find it out, they will immediately have their patriotism aroused and the consequences will come. I welcome that day.

I think that of all politicians the cheapest politician I know of is the man who will starve a hungry man because he cannot control his vote. I think the politician who is the cheapest is the man who will make little children go hungry because their father is a Republican, or because their father does not vote for the right Democrat in the primary election. Those are cheap politicians. Those are the men who should have the stigma of condemnation of the American people.

We know these things are true. Harry Hopkins knows they are true. As I stated at the beginning, politics oozes out of every place possible in the W. P. A., politics not alone to control local offices, but to make the United States Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of no more consequence than the Reichstag is under Hitler. That is the purpose. "Vote right and you get projects. Vote wrong and we will tell the people that you fought against relief." Out of human misery they are making a political game.

Oh, the conscience of Harry Hopkins, if he has one, must indeed be something that would be worthy of the study of the medical profession for years to come.

I would have some regard for the great controller of the Iowa election, where the tall corn grows taller and the projects grow larger in Mr. WEARIN's district, back in those districts where we find Harry Hopkins participating, if he had the manhood to stand up and say, "Yes, there is politics in the W. P. A. We are using the W. P. A. to feed the people, and we are also using it to elect those men who will vote right in the United States Senate." I would have more respect for him. A highway robber is better than a pick-pocket. Let us condemn a man who goes off in a corner with Senators and plans how he can get away with politics in the W. P. A. and not get caught. Harry Hopkins does that, and we all know he does it.

I wish it had been possible for me to have been here yesterday to discuss this matter. I did not have time to prepare these remarks. I did get the Pittsburgh papers, and a little more information about some other places. Before the debate is concluded I want the people to find out the truth about the W. P. A., how the relief funds are used, not just to feed the hungry, but to control the Congress of the United States, so that they can have, not a few Charley McCarthys but a majority. I think that some of them ought to have

telephones directly from Jimmy Roosevelt's desk, so that they may not go wrong in case of a quick vote and lose a W. P. A. project. I hope that the people of the United States will realize that in W. P. A. there is waste and politics, because some are afraid to speak their minds and vote their own sentiments. I can say that; some Democrats will not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the first amendment of the committee.

Mr. HOLT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Dieterich	King	Pepper
Andrews	Donahey	La Follette	Pittman
Austin	Duffy	Lee	Pope
Bankhead	Ellender	Lewis	Radcliffe
Barkley	Frazier	Lodge	Russell
Berry	George	Logan	Schwartz
Bilbo	Gerry	Loneragan	Schwellenbach
Bone	Gibson	Lundeen	Sheppard
Borah	Gillette	McAdoo	Shipstead
Brown, Mich.	Glass	McCarran	Smathers
Brown, N. H.	Green	McGill	Smith
Bulkeley	Guffey	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Bulow	Hale	McNary	Thomas, Utah
Burke	Harrison	Maloney	Townsend
Byrd	Hatch	Miller	Truman
Byrnes	Hayden	Milton	Vandenberg
Capper	Herring	Minton	Van Nuys
Caraway	Hill	Murray	Wagner
Chavez	Hitchcock	Neely	Walsh
Clark	Holt	Norris	Wheeler
Connally	Hughes	Nye	White
Copeland	Johnson, Calif.	O'Mahoney	
Davis	Johnson, Colo.	Overton	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Ninety Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on the first committee amendment, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The first committee amendment is on page 1, line 3, after the resolving clause, to insert:

This joint resolution may be cited as the "Work Relief and Public Works Appropriation Act of 1938."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I sent forward two amendments—

Mr. BARKLEY. They are not in order now.

Mr. COPELAND. Why not?

Mr. BARKLEY. Under the unanimous-consent agreement committee amendments are first to be considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendments have not been considered.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest to the Senator from New York that under the unanimous-consent agreement already entered into the committee amendments must be disposed of before amendments are offered from the floor.

Mr. COPELAND. I suppose I have a right to the floor, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York has been recognized.

Mr. COPELAND. I wish to present an amendment, and I ask that it be stated from the desk, on page 3 of the joint resolution, in line 12, after the numerals "\$285,000,000", to insert:

Of which \$1,500,000 shall be allotted to the Department of Agriculture for establishment or maintenance of aerological stations for observing, measuring, and investigating atmospheric phenomena.

My second amendment is on page 20, at the end of line 21, to insert:

Of the foregoing sum there is appropriated and there shall be allotted \$10,000,000 to be expended by the Department of Commerce for the establishment, construction, alteration, and modernization of aids to air navigation, and acquisition of necessary sites by lease or grant.

Concerning the importance of these amendments, which I shall press at the proper time, I desire to make some comments upon the necessity—

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me to make a brief statement?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. As the Senator knows, I have been urging speedy consideration of the joint resolution, together with all amendments which have been proposed by the committee, and all that may be offered from the floor. I have no desire to cut off legitimate debate on the joint resolution at any point. I do not know whether or not the rumor is true, but the rumor is afloat that a deliberate effort is to be made to delay a vote on the joint resolution until next week. In view of that situation, I wish to advise the Senate that the usual Saturday recess will not be taken, and that we shall be in session on Monday, if the joint resolution is not disposed of this week, unless the Senate otherwise decides.

I make that statement because Senators may have engagements which they may wish to change or cancel. I myself have been compelled to cancel two engagements in my own State, because I think the passage of the joint resolution is more important than any speech I or any other Senator could make in his own or any other State.

I feel that the Senate is entitled to that information at this time. Unless we can dispose of the joint resolution before Saturday, we shall be in session on Saturday; and unless we can dispose of it on Saturday, we shall attempt to meet on Monday.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. So far as I am concerned, I have not occupied the time of the Senate for more than 10 minutes in connection with the pending joint resolution, and I do not intend to occupy more than 10 minutes in its future discussion. However, Mr. President, it seems to me that in the case of a measure involving probably the most stupendous appropriation ever made in the history of any nation, or in the whole history of the world, totaling nearly \$5,000,000,000, while much of the debate has not been on the measure itself, consideration for a week, or even 2 weeks, is not unduly long discussion of a measure of such magnitude.

So far as I am concerned, I intend to be in Washington on Saturday anyway. I shall be glad to stay with the Senator from Kentucky on Saturday, on Sunday, if he desires, and on Monday, or at night sessions. However, it seems to me that the threat of pressure comes at an unduly early time in the discussion.

So far as I am concerned, I am engaged in no filibuster, and do not desire to engage in a filibuster. I desire to see the joint resolution passed at the earliest practicable moment, and to see the Congress adjourn at the earliest practicable moment. I suggest that the threat of the majority leader comes unduly early in the discussion of this measure.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator from New York will yield further, I am making no threat. In view of the suggestion which is afloat, as everybody knows, that we shall not be permitted to vote on the measure this week, I merely made the statement that we ought not at this late time in the session to be taking our usual week-end recess, and we ought to meet on Saturday and on Monday.

In order that Senators might accommodate themselves to that program, I felt that I should make the announcement. I am not objecting to legitimate debate; but, inasmuch as we are to have debate, I think it ought to proceed speedily and without the customary week-end recess.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I am satisfied that Senators will be glad to remain in session tonight, tomorrow, tomorrow night, Saturday, Saturday night, Sunday, and Monday if the Senator from Kentucky so desires.

However, there has been no suggestion of a filibuster. I am afraid the Senator from Kentucky has been listening to some cloakroom rumor or to some discussion in the President's room among our newspaper friends, who are suggesting a filibuster. So far as I know, there has been no such suggestion on this floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have not been in the President's room and I have not received the rumor from any newspaper reports. The rumor has been thick on the floor of the Senate, having been discussed among Senators; and I have not been compelled to go outside the Chamber in order to hear it.

I am not objecting to legitimate debate. Any Senator has a legitimate right to debate a measure as long as he desires to do so. Inasmuch as that program is to be followed, I think we ought to remain in session day after day until the joint resolution is disposed of.

Mr. CLARK. I am certain many Senators will be glad to stay with the Senator from Kentucky as long as he may desire, maintaining a quorum on the floor as far as possible, and disposing of the public business as fast as it can be disposed of.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I am quite willing to remain here on Saturday and Monday; but I hope the Senator from Missouri will not penalize the Senator from Kentucky by holding us to night sessions.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. I ask that the amendments offered by the Senator from New York be stated from the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments have not been sent to the desk and have not yet been offered. As the Chair understood, the Senator from New York announced that he would later offer the amendments.

Mr. COPELAND. I will say to the Senator from Nebraska that I am seeking to earmark the funds in relation to two projects. First, I wish to earmark \$1,500,000 for the purpose of completing Weather Bureau stations which are necessary for the protection of aviation. Second, I am asking for \$10,000,000 to complete the work necessary to install ground facilities for the protection of aviation.

Mr. NORRIS. Has the Senator offered his amendments?

Mr. COPELAND. I was told by my leader that, under the agreement, I could not offer them at this time. I read them.

Mr. NORRIS. Are the amendments of the Senator from New York amendments to committee amendments?

Mr. COPELAND. They are amendments to the joint resolution, but I am told that they are not now in order. I should like to explain them.

Mr. NORRIS. Why are they not in order?

Mr. COPELAND. The committee amendments must first be considered.

Mr. NORRIS. I understand that; but the Senator's proposed amendments are amendments to committee amendments, are they not?

Mr. COPELAND. No; they are amendments to the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will make a statement as to the parliamentary situation. The first committee amendment has been agreed to. The question now is on the second committee amendment, to which several Senators have proposed amendments, which have been printed and are now lying on the table.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, there is so much disorder in the Chamber that we cannot hear the statement of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let there be order in the Chamber. At least one Senator expresses a desire to be informed as to the present parliamentary situation. The Chair will again state it, in the hope that there will be sufficient order, at least, for the Senator who made the inquiry to hear.

The first amendment of the committee has been agreed to. The question now is on the second committee amendment. To that amendment several Senators have sent to the desk amendments which have been printed, but none of which have been called up. The Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND] has the floor.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. By "the second committee amendment" does the Chair mean the one on page 2, line 3?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment on page 2, line 3, is now the pending question.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, may we have the amendment stated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 3, after the word "Administration", it is proposed to strike out "\$1,250,000,000" and insert "\$1,425,000,000", so as to read:

(1) To the Works Progress Administration, \$1,425,000,000, together with the balances of allocations heretofore made or hereafter to be made to the Works Progress Administration under the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1937 and the joint resolution of March 2, 1938, which remain unobligated on June 30, 1938.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment just stated.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, in connection with the pending amendment, and other provisions of the joint resolution, I am seeking, I say frankly, to earmark as much of the funds appropriated by the measure as possible. I have no present desire to suggest any reduction in the total amount of money carried by the joint resolution. I am determined, so far as I am personally concerned, to do what I can, in honor, to make certain that the money appropriated shall be used for the benefit of the people and shall not be used as political fodder, as, in my judgment, has been the case in the past.

I do not regard it as morally decent for the Congress of the United States to abdicate its responsibilities and its powers and turn over to anybody, any individual or any board, the allocation and the expenditure of the sums to be appropriated by the pending joint resolution. That and nothing else is what I have in mind. I am going to do all I can, in decency, to earmark the appropriations provided by the joint resolution so that the money shall be expended for purposes which will add to the national wealth, to the physical welfare of the Nation as well as to the sustenance of people who are in distress, to feeding, clothing, and sheltering them. That is my object, and I do not see how any man can question the propriety of such a position.

It is my opinion that every informed person in the United States is convinced that the money appropriated in the past, while I have no doubt that it has been honestly expended, has been so placed as to influence elections.

I heard debate here yesterday with reference to one of our colleagues and the efforts being made to defeat him. I stood here shoulder to shoulder with a group of Senators from both sides of the aisle to fight against the proposed change in the Supreme Court. I am not a candidate for office next fall, but there are Senators here who will then be candidates for office, Senators who stood on the floor to fight for the preservation of that chief American institution—the Supreme Court. So far as I can do it, I desire to prevent the possibility of reprisals against anyone of that gallant band.

It will make little difference to me personally, Mr. President, how this money shall be spent. To me human beings are all alike. I do not care whether the man fed is a Republican or a Democrat; I do not care whether he is a New Dealer or the kind of a Democrat I am. If he is in need, I want him to be helped; I want him to be helped, even if he votes against me when I am a candidate for office. But I would not be true to the fellowship represented here, to the friendships I am proud to have in this body, I would not be true to my convictions if I did not use every ounce of energy I possess to make it impossible for the juggling of these funds in order that this, that, or the other Senator may be defeated, or someone who takes a different view from the views that we hold may be elected.

Mr. President, I have no more desire to be here next Saturday or next Monday than has any other Senator. There is

just one place to which I want to go. It is a farm in the mountains of my State. I would rather be there now than any other place in the world. I want to go there just as soon as I can. But I am ready to stay here indefinitely if by remaining I can have some small part in accomplishing the objective I have in my mind and which I have presented to the Senate.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEE in the chair). Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. LUNDEEN. It seems that one trouble with legislation during the past few years is that it has been too hastily considered. If the Senator will permit me, I should like to say that we have not studied legislative proposals as carefully as we should have done. I remember that not so very long ago, in a moment of legislative hysteria, a bill was passed in Congress without even being printed and without being read. I opposed that bill on the floor of the House for that very reason. If I remember correctly, the bill related to banking legislation in the 1933 emergency.

A little while later it was found necessary to amend it. We discovered that it had not been considered as thoroughly as it should have been. I think there should be a reasonable amount of debate. I certainly want to do everything I can to aid in remedying present economic conditions. It does not make any difference to me what party puts forward a measure with that object in view, I will try to go along. But we should debate more thoroughly and study more carefully the provisions of the pending measure. I think the Senator from New York is absolutely correct in bringing this matter to our attention. Whether or not we agree with him, he is certainly contributing to the thought and the debate upon the subject, and that can do no harm, for certainly hastily considered and enacted legislation and half-baked legislation, such as is passed from time to time, is not going to provide any cure or remedy. We then have to go back to the starting point, and often we find ourselves below the starting point. We cannot afford to do that very many times more. We have now come to the point where we have to get down to bedrock; and perhaps we have not so much more time to get down to bedrock as we think we have.

Mr. COPELAND. I thank the Senator for his very sensible statement. I agree with him 100 percent. It means nothing to me personally what the joint resolution carries; but I am a Member of this body. I took a solemn oath at the Vice President's desk, and I do not intend to shirk any responsibility which is mine. I do not intend to hide behind anybody's skirts.

It is our duty to tell how to spend this money. If we do not write a measure which is acceptable to the White House, the President has a constitutional power to veto the bill, and he has a perfect right to do it. I shall honor him for any position he may take which comes from the conviction of his soul; but I have a conviction in my soul, Mr. President. I am not willing to be a party to the enactment of any sort of legislation concerning which there can be any breath of scandal when the legislation is enacted and administered.

Will anyone rise and say that there has not been the breath of scandal in connection with the expenditure of funds which we in our wisdom have voted, and have turned over to governmental administrators to expend? Can anyone say that there was no scandal connected with it? Every Member of the Senate knows that there was scandal connected with it. Why should the head of any poor family in New York City, or in Colorado, or anywhere else, be given an intimation by some circuitous route that "If you do not do so-and-so, you will lose your job and get no money from the relief funds"? I do not want that to happen.

The other day I submitted an amendment to this joint resolution, which lies on the table, proposing that we earmark \$325,000,000—for what? For river and harbor projects

and flood-control projects, every one of which has had a survey. Every one of these projects is first passed upon by a committee of the Senate, sent to the Army engineers for examination and survey, brought back from the Army engineers if found economically feasible and worthy, approved by a committee, brought to the floor of the Senate, and by a Senate vote approved and the authorization provided for.

Mr. MINTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. MINTON. I am not informed about the authorizations, but I have heard it stated that many of the so-called projects about which the Senator has been talking have not even been surveyed. Is that true?

Mr. COPELAND. That is not true. I have been chairman of the Commerce Committee for a number of years, and I was well instructed by my predecessors in that office, including the able Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON]. I took pride, 2 years ago, in presenting to the Senate the bill and being able to say, "This is not a 'pork barrel' bill. Every item here has been approved." I suggested that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. MINTON] be given a gold medal because he wanted something taken out of the bill. That never happened before, and it probably never will happen again. It was one of the most amazing legislative spectacles I have ever witnessed.

These projects have been approved; and if there is a project here which is not a worth-while project or is an unauthorized project, it must come out.

We have a total of about \$511,000,000 worth of projects which have been authorized. There is in the Army engineers' office a book called the Blue Book. It contains projects which have been examined, passed upon, and found to be economically feasible or otherwise by the Army engineers. The projects total over a billion dollars. From time to time during the past 3 or 4 years we have actually authorized projects amounting, as I recall, to about \$511,000,000. From those projects we selected a number, reducing the total to \$325,000,000; and I want to say that I asked that a number of New York projects be omitted. I say that here now so that 2 years from now, when I run for the Senate, somebody may pick it up and show that I admitted that I had done that; but I wanted to do that, and other men on the committee did the same thing, and the amendment which I offered was adopted upon motion and by action of the Commerce Committee.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I should like to make an inquiry concerning the Senator's amendment. Some of the States seem to have only one project, or perhaps none. Other States seem to have quite a number of projects. I wonder how the selection of these projects was arrived at. I do not mean to intimate that the list is unfair at all, but I am just wondering how it was arrived at.

Mr. COPELAND. I will tell the Senator. The fact is we had to hunt pretty hard to find approved projects in some States. There are many States that have no rivers of any consequence and certainly no coast line, and we did not find very much there that had been approved. For instance, in Vermont we found only one project, known as the Union Village Reservoir, \$1,878,600. That was the reason.

My friend from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is extremely fortunate in his allocations; I mean fortunate, if it is a good thing to have a considerable amount of money allocated for flood-control and river projects in West Virginia, and of course it is. He must have twenty or twenty-five million dollars of projects in his State. Perhaps he has added up the projects. Why has he that many? Because his State borders on the Ohio River. Some of the worst floods we have had in America have been on that river. Then he has in his State great tributaries of the Ohio River, and in order to complete the work in the valley it is necessary to build reservoirs in West Virginia to hold back there the water which

otherwise would flow into the Ohio and then down into the Mississippi Valley. So we did not undertake to make any 7- or 10- or 5-percent allocation, so as to give every State an equal amount. The question was, Where will the money do the most good and where is it likely to preserve life and property to the greatest extent?

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. NEELY. I desire to express my gratitude to the able Senator from New York for the sympathetic consideration he has given to the various West Virginia projects to which he has referred and which, as the Senator has just indicated, are important not only to West Virginia but to everyone who lives in the Mississippi Valley.

Mr. COPELAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President—

Mr. COPELAND. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

NORTH HARBOR OF MINNEAPOLIS

Mr. LUNDEEN. I wish to inquire of the Senator from New York concerning the item of \$1,000,000 for the Mississippi River between the mouth of the Missouri River and Minneapolis. I wonder if, by any chance, that includes some work on the north harbor of Minneapolis, within the city limits of Minneapolis.

Mr. COPELAND. Would that be above the Falls of St. Anthony?

Mr. LUNDEEN. Yes.

Mr. COPELAND. No; it does not include that item.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Will the Senator permit me to make a short statement at this point?

Mr. COPELAND. Yes.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I should like to say to the Senate that in the State of Minnesota, in the great city of Minneapolis—the largest center in the Northwest, where we have a population center of over a million within a radius of 25 miles, one of the few centers in the world where is found a population of over a million—we have there the north-harbor project, which is above the Falls of St. Anthony. There are no locks at the Falls of St. Anthony; the land comes down very gently to the water's edge and furnishes ground for warehouses, and freight can be trucked from a barge on the river through the warehouse and onto the railroad tracks just back of the warehouse, or where the warehouse could be built. This is an important project, and it just so happens that this was where we had the great lumber mills of Minnesota and the Northwest, which have now been taken away, and nothing has been built there to replace them. It will make the greatest inland harbor in America.

BUILD THE NORTH HARBOR OF MINNEAPOLIS NOW

I am just wondering whether or not it would be possible in this improvement on the Mississippi River to include this harbor. It seems it would come within the scope of the proposed river improvement because when the 9-foot channel was put through it included Minneapolis, and that means the north limit of Minneapolis, which would include this harbor site. Any other contention is absurd. It is vital to the prosperity and business of our great city of Minneapolis. We must have this harbor where we could load our barges and carry on business.

Some might say to the Senator from New York, "Here is your harbor below the Falls of St. Anthony. But it is down over a hundred feet below the level of the city, the freight has to be trucked up, and the incline to the railroad is very steep." It is too small; it is a village harbor, that is all. So that our north harbor is an essential project for Minneapolis and Minnesota and the whole Northwest. I would like to see a larger item in the bill covering this matter, and I would like to see this project included if possible.

LAKE TRAVERSE PROJECT

Here is another item, "Flood control, Lake Traverse, S. Dak. and Minn." I happen to know that that is a worthy project. Perhaps the remarks of the Senator may apply

to us when he says that in some States it is rather difficult to find approved projects. Perhaps we will have to set about to get approval for some of our projects all over again, and how long shall we of Minnesota be left standing at the door waiting for the initial north-harbor appropriation?

MINNETONKA LAKE LEVEL

We have stormed at the administration for years to have our marvelous and beautiful Lake Minnetonka restored. Some of our good citizens are getting discouraged. So far as I am concerned, I will go on demanding these worthy and necessary improvements and I will persist until I win. These projects mean work for our Minnesota unemployed. I know the Senator is sympathetic with our north harbor, and I thank him for yielding.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEE in the chair). Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. Yesterday, when this amendment was first brought before the Senate, and when I had had opportunity to read it but briefly, I derived the impression that there was nothing provided for Massachusetts on the Merrimack. Since then I have had a chance to study the amendment, and I find there is a \$2,000,000 item for Franklin Falls in New Hampshire. I believe the Senator will agree with me that that item will of course benefit the people who live in the more thickly populated communities at the Massachusetts end of the Merrimack.

Mr. COPELAND. That is correct.

Mr. LODGE. I ask the Senator further whether it is not true that all the projects listed in Massachusetts are approved by the Army engineers, and in fact if every project which is not appropriated for in some other way and has been approved by the Army engineers is not included in the Senator's amendment.

Mr. COPELAND. That is correct.

Mr. LODGE. I think the Senator has made a very fine statement.

Mr. COPELAND. I wish to say, in reply to the Senator from Minnesota, who spoke about the North Harbor at Minneapolis, that some of us tried to include in the Army bill an item of \$7,000,000 for the work above the Falls of St. Anthony on the Mississippi River. From a study of the map I am familiar with the needs of that section. Not alone are the sawmills of which the Senator spoke important, but there are great grain elevators and flour mills above the Falls of St. Anthony and there can be no doubt that the completion of that project would be of great benefit to Minneapolis. At least that is my opinion.

I thought of reminding the Senator that there are certain other agencies of transportation which are sometimes jealous of water development. I have not heard of any indications of enthusiasm from the railroads in that section for the development of this project, but it is one which should be completed, as I view it.

At another time I shall speak in much greater detail about the flood-control bill. I rose today to speak about matters relating to aviation.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. I recall that a few days ago the Committee on Commerce, of which the able Senator from New York is chairman, reported an authorization bill covering a large number of flood-control projects. The Senator now has an amendment pending. Does the amendment include all the projects included in the flood control authorization bill?

Mr. COPELAND. I would not say all of them, but a large number of them.

Mr. McNARY. The amendment is not a duplicate of the bill reported by the committee?

Mr. COPELAND. No, because it picks up projects approved 2 years ago and 3 years ago.

Mr. McNARY. Why did not the Senator include all those which the committee reported favorably, as well as those he now mentions as being supplemental?

Mr. COPELAND. The Senator is entitled to a frank answer. I myself, as a member of the committee, did not think we ought to earmark the entire amount. The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] has presented an amendment authorizing the completion of projects which heretofore have been examined and found meritorious by the Public Works Administration, all approved projects. It did not seem as if we could take all the money for these projects, and we did not have any idea of increasing the sum. If we had taken all the money, there would not have been anything for the other projects which have been approved by the Public Works Administration. It is a question as to which are the most urgent.

I return now to the matter of aviation. We were shocked yesterday to hear about the burning of the airplane at Cleveland. I think I am correct in saying there was nothing the Government could have done to prevent the accident, which occurred because of conditions in the plane itself.

Mr. McADOO. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. McADOO. I notice that in the Senator's amendment he specifies the projects in the various States to which the \$324,235,900 is to be applied. How were these determinations made with respect to the different States? In other words, how was it decided which projects the money was to be spent upon, and the amount to be allotted each of the projects?

Mr. COPELAND. My answer to the Senator is, to repeat what I said to the Senator from Oregon a little while ago—

Mr. McADOO. I regret I was not on the floor at the time.

Mr. COPELAND. I stated that if we were to include in this bill every project which has been surveyed and recommended by the Army engineers and authorized by the Congress, it would consume every dollar of this appropriation.

Mr. McADOO. I concede that. The point I want to get at is as to the allocations which have been made. Who determines the projects and the amounts to be allocated to the different projects in the various States? Let us take my own State, for instance. Who selects the projects in that State, with the suggested allocations?

Mr. COPELAND. In the original list—

Mr. McADOO. What is the original list?

Mr. COPELAND. The list of all the projects heretofore approved, amounting in all to nearly \$512,000,000. It would be extremely selfish for those of us who are interested in water improvement to take all the money which has been set out in the bill for that purpose. So we did a little figuring. Has the Senator the amendment before him?

Mr. McADOO. I have. The items pertaining to California appear on page 23. All I wanted to know was the manner and the method by which the determinations were made with respect to projects for my State.

Mr. COPELAND. I will tell the Senator how that was done. There is an authorization of \$2,000,000 for San Diego Harbor in California. In the amendment we made the item \$1,000,000, because we were seeking to take projects which could be started at once and, if possible, completed within a year. Many of the projects in the Senator's State will take several years to complete. So we made inquiry of the War Department and found that \$1,000,000 could be used within the year for San Diego Harbor.

Mr. McADOO. I am interested to know who advised this distribution and made the selection of the places. Was it done by the Commerce Committee as a whole, or by the Senator from New York as chairman, or by the Army engineers?

Mr. COPELAND. Oh, no; there was a group from the committee, made up of those who are particularly interested in waterways. I want the Senator to be convinced that utter fairness prevailed in the matter. As I said a little while ago—

and it will be used against me a couple of years from now in New York—I requested that a good many million dollars be omitted in New York because I did not want to be charged with favoritism.

Mr. McADOO. The point that strikes me at once is that I myself was not consulted as to my State.

Mr. COPELAND. No; but the Army engineers were consulted.

Mr. McADOO. That is what I am getting at. They recommended these distributions, and the particular projects for the particular localities.

Mr. COPELAND. Yes. Let me show the Senator how that was done.

Mr. McADOO. Pardon me just a moment. The amendment provides that over \$300,000,000 shall be expended by the Secretary of War in the various States.

Mr. COPELAND. Yes.

Mr. McADOO. Who determined the amount that should be allocated to the State of California? Was that determined by the Army engineers?

Mr. COPELAND. Yes. We did it in this way: When the report was made covering all the projects outstanding, representing \$512,000,000, we saw at once that we could not venture to ask for that amount of money. So we asked the Army engineers how we could spend \$325,000,000, and the ultimate allocation represented by the amendment was made upon their recommendation.

Mr. McADOO. As I look over this list, I note that some projects in the State which are very important, and in a very large degree exigent, are entirely omitted.

Mr. COPELAND. They are omitted because they are not authorized.

Mr. McADOO. No; we have many projects that are already authorized and are not covered in the amendment.

Mr. COPELAND. Authorized by the Congress?

Mr. McADOO. Yes; authorized by the flood-control legislation. Take, for instance, the Santa Maria River. It is a very important project. I do not see any allocation in the amendment for that project. The Santa Maria River went on a rampage a year ago and washed out everything in sight, including the concrete highway bridge on the main artery between Los Angeles and San Francisco. I think the Army engineers have made a final report on the project. The survey was authorized.

Mr. COPELAND. The survey was authorized, and it may be that the Army engineers have recommended it; but unless we have overlooked a single item, I do not think the Congress has authorized it.

Mr. McADOO. Congress has authorized the survey.

Mr. COPELAND. Congress has authorized the survey; yes.

Mr. McADOO. Congress has authorized the survey, and the survey has been made, and the report has been made. It has also authorized the project. However, I shall not interrogate the Senator further until I have looked into the question a little more thoroughly, and then I shall ask him if he will be so kind as to indulge me with a little more information.

Mr. COPELAND. I will be very glad to give the Senator the information later, but I think I can give it to him now, subject to correction.

If the Santa Maria River project was surveyed, examined, found economically justified, recommended to the committee, and authorized by Congress—if all those steps had been taken, it would have been included in the amendment.

Mr. McADOO. I may say to the Senator that, of course, I am not fully informed as to whether every one of those steps has been taken. I shall not press the question any further. I shall look into the subject, and I shall ask the Senator to indulge me a little later with further information.

Mr. COPELAND. I shall be very glad to give it to the Senator. We tried to be extremely generous with California. I myself have a great personal interest in California.

Mr. McADOO. I wish to say to the Senator at once that he has always been very fair to my State. I have no com-

plaint to make about the matter, but I was only looking into it with the view of getting some correction made if that shall be necessary.

Mr. COPELAND. Tomorrow, after having examined the record, I shall ask the Army engineers to advise me.

Mr. McADOO. I thank the Senator.

Mr. COPELAND. I wish to make a further statement. Los Angeles County needs a great deal of help. One of the most startling statements I ever heard made before the Commerce Committee was made by General Pillsbury some years ago. It was so startling that I asked him to repeat it. The Senator does not know that I practiced medicine for a little while in Los Angeles, so I have always had an interest in Los Angeles. General Pillsbury said that in Los Angeles County are found the makings of the most terrible flood disaster that could happen in the United States.

Mr. McADOO. It has come since. His prediction was correct.

Mr. COPELAND. Yes; his prediction was correct. I asked him to repeat his statement. He did repeat it. When the disastrous flood recently occurred there I thought, "Well, General Pillsbury is thinking about what he told us."

In view of our feeling about that situation, the Senator will find that in the amendment as presented we have included \$8,800,000 for Los Angeles County against the authorized appropriation of \$11,800,000. Five million dollars was authorized for the Santa Ana River, and we granted \$3,000,000. I shall talk to the Senator about that, because this matter, of course, is subject to such correction as may be needed.

I have not proceeded far with respect to aviation, and I desire to pursue that subject. One of the most remarkable advances of modern times is the development of aviation. We are now flying airships as great as the next largest of the ships used by Columbus in his trip to discover America, and there will be launched very shortly an airship which will be greater in tonnage and capacity than the largest of Columbus' ships. Airships are now made that have greater capacity than a Pullman car.

I am sometimes disturbed by the progress of invention and development in the field of aviation, because I think I may say I have knowledge of the inadequacy of the ground facilities, the navigational aids, the weather reporting, and the other factors which enter into safe flying.

The air is a great ocean. As the merchant marine developed, it was found necessary for governments everywhere to provide lighthouses, range lights, buoys, and other devices for the protection of navigation upon the sea.

Navigation in the air is remarkably like navigation on the sea in many respects. But I often think about the old colored man who said that he liked to travel on a railroad train better than on a ship, because, he said, "If the railroad train runs off the tracks, why, there you is; but if the ship sinks, where is you?" That suggestion could be applied with even greater force to aviation.

I do not want to pose as a habitual prophet, but I prophesied the disasters which occurred north of Los Angeles and in the Rocky Mountains. With the lack of navigational facilities and weather reporting, such disasters were inevitable. A plane cannot be sent through the air in all sorts of weather with hope of safe landing unless there are devices to steer the ship and to make known to the pilot at all times where he is.

We have spent much money during the past few years in correcting the serious lack of navigational aids; but we have fallen down. For a number of years we made no appropriations. In 1933, 1934, 1935, and 1936 we pared down the appropriations for air protection in the interest of economy, in the interest of dollars. It was not until the death of our colleague, the late Senator Cutting, that any serious effort was made by the Congress to go extensively into a study of aviation with a view to determining what, if anything, should be done to bring about greater safety in the air.

Senate Report 2455, of the Seventy-fourth Congress, is a report of the Safety-in-the-Air Committee. I observe from

the caption of the report that the committee consisted of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. DONAHEY], and myself, from the Committee on Commerce. The report plainly sets forth the great mistake of our financial policy in effect at the time the report was presented, on the 20th of June 1936.

We made another report—Senate Report No. 185—toward the close of the first session of the Seventy-fifth Congress. These reports clearly point the way to a logical policy. The reports were written after several years of intensive investigation of the reasons why our beloved colleague died, and also of what we might do to protect other citizens of the United States against such a calamity.

Of course, expenditures for public works should not be blindly made at the sacrifice of our national defense. My experience tells me that the present Congress is on the verge of doing that very thing, at a time when the air is filled with war on two continents, and the Congress, spurred by the advice of our President, is loosening the purse strings and pouring huge sums into implements of war. However, I fear that in this great program of national defense there are gaps which must be filled at some time or other by congressional action.

STANDARDS OF WAGES AND HOURS OF LABOR

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the wage and hour bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHWELLENBACH in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2475) to provide for the establishment of fair labor standards in employments in and affecting interstate commerce, and for other purposes.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, ask for a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the conferees on the part of the Senate be appointed by the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Utah?

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I shall not object to the request of the Senator from Utah. Assurance has been given that in the conference every section of the country will be represented. I am very much interested in the proposed legislation, and I hope something may be worked out in the conference which will be fair to every section of the country.

Therefore, I shall offer no objection to the request.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. OVERTON. The bill was passed by the Senate and sent over to the House, and the House struck out everything after the enacting clause. What is now before the Senate is the amendment of the House to the Senate bill. What would be the authority of the conferees? Would they have authority to rewrite the bill? It is my recollection that the Vice President so held at the time the farm bill was before us for consideration.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator is correct about the matter.

Mr. OVERTON. As I understand, every feature of the legislation will be in conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has been informed by the Parliamentarian that the conference will have very wide latitude in passing upon the questions involved in the legislation.

Mr. OVERTON. Will the ruling of the Vice President in the case of the farm bill apply to the wage and hour bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Until the precise question is presented to the Chair, of course, that question cannot be answered. It is the opinion of the present occupant of the Chair that if precisely the same question were presented in connection with the wage and hour bill which was pre-

sented on the farm bill, the ruling of the Chair would be the same as it was upon the farm bill.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Utah? The Chair hears none.

The PRESIDING OFFICER appointed Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. WALSH, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. BORAH, and Mr. LA FOLLETTE conferees on the part of the Senate.

RELIEF AND WORK-RELIEF APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 679) making appropriations for work relief, relief, and otherwise to increase employment by providing loans and grants for public-works projects.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, when I was interrupted—

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, does the Senator from New York desire to continue or to conclude his remarks tonight?

Mr. COPELAND. I wish to follow the desire of my leader.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have no desire except that which is in the mind of the Senator from New York. If he wishes to suspend now, or cannot conclude his remarks this afternoon, I am willing to move a recess after we shall have had a brief executive session.

Mr. COPELAND. Very well; I yield for that purpose.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] has a small bill which he has asked to be permitted to take up at this time. It is a bridge bill which will not consume any time. Meanwhile, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHWELLENBACH in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. SHEPPARD, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported favorably the nominations of several officers for promotion, and also for appointment, by transfer, in the Regular Army.

Mr. MCKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The reports will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, from the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably the nominations of certain young men to be ensigns in the Coast Guard, and ask unanimous consent for their present consideration. If that request is granted, I shall ask unanimous consent that the President be notified of their confirmation, because the commencement exercises are to take place the first of next week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the Coast Guard nominations? The Chair hears none. The nominations will be read.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of ensigns in the United States Coast Guard.

Mr. COPELAND. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Coast Guard be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. COPELAND. I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified of the confirmation of the Coast Guard nominations.

If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state, in their order, the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

THE JUDICIARY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William Ryan to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

That concludes the calendar.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate resume legislative session.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed legislative session.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER BRIDGE, DUBUQUE, IOWA

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate bill 3892, Calendar No. 1951.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the title of the bill.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 3892) creating the City of Dubuque Bridge Commission and authorizing said commission and its successors to purchase and/or construct, maintain, and operate a bridge or bridges across the Mississippi River at or near Dubuque, Iowa, and East Dubuque, Ill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments.

The amendments were, in section 9, page 14, line 18, after the word "thereof", to insert "shall be applied to the purposes specified in this act. The members"; on page 17, after line 18, to insert a new section, to be known as section 12; and in line 24, to change the number of the section from 12 to 13, so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to facilitate interstate commerce, improve the postal service, and provide for military and other purposes, the City of Dubuque Bridge Commission (hereinafter created, and hereinafter referred to as the "commission"), and its successors and assigns, be, and are hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge or bridges and approaches thereto, across the Mississippi River at or near the cities of Dubuque, Iowa, and East Dubuque, Ill., at a point suitable to the interest of navigation, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act. For like purposes said Commission, or its successors and assigns, are hereby authorized to purchase, maintain, and operate all or any existing bridges for vehicular traffic crossing the Mississippi River at or near the city of Dubuque, Iowa, and may acquire control of any or all such existing bridges by purchase of stock in any corporation owning any such bridges, or by a conveyance from such corporation, and, in any case, said Commission shall be authorized to maintain and operate said bridge or bridges subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act.

Sec. 2. There is hereby conferred upon the Commission and its successors and assigns the right and power to enter upon such lands and to acquire, condemn, occupy, possess, and use such real estate and other property in the State of Iowa and the State of Illinois, including real estate and other property acquired for or devoted to a public use or other purposes by the State of Illinois or the State of Iowa, or any governmental or political subdivisions thereof, as may be needed for the location, construction, operation, and maintenance of any such bridge and its approaches, upon making just compensation therefor, to be ascertained and paid according to the laws of the State in which such real estate or other property is situated, and the proceedings therefor shall be the same as in the condemnation of private property for public purpose in said State, respectively.

Sec. 3. The Commission and its successors and assigns are hereby authorized to fix and charge tolls for transit over such bridge or bridges in accordance with the provisions of this act, subject to the approval of the Secretary of War, as provided by the act of Congress approved March 23, 1906.

Sec. 4. The Commission and its successors and assigns are hereby authorized to provide for the payment of the cost of such bridge or bridges as may be purchased or constructed, as provided herein, and approaches (including the approach highways which, in the judgment of the Commission, it is necessary or advisable to construct or cause to be constructed to provide suitable and adequate connection with existing improved highways) and the necessary land, easements, and appurtenances thereto, by an issue or issues of negotiable bonds of the Commission, bearing interest at the rate or rates of not more than 6 percent per annum, the principal and interest of which bonds, and any premium to be paid for retirement thereof before maturity, shall be payable solely from the sinking fund provided in accordance with this act, and such payments may be further secured by mortgage of the bridge or bridges. In like manner, bonds may be issued to pay the cost of improvements and permanent repairs to any bridge or bridges purchased. All such bonds may be registerable as to principal alone or both principal and interest, shall be in such form not inconsistent with this act, shall mature at such time or times not exceeding 25 years from their respective dates, shall be in such denominations, shall be executed in such manner, and shall be payable in such medium and at such place or places as the Commission may determine. The Commission may repurchase and may reserve the right to redeem all or any of said bonds before maturity in such manner and at such price or prices, not exceeding 105 and accrued interest, as may be fixed by the Commission prior to the issuance of the bonds. The Commission, when it deems it to be to the best interest of the Commission, may issue refunding bonds to repurchase and redeem any outstanding bonds before the maturity thereof: *Provided*, That the refunding bonds shall mature at such time or times, not exceeding 50 years from the date of approval of this act, as the Commission may determine. The Commission may enter into an agreement with any bank or trust company in the United States as trustee having the power to make such agreement, setting forth the duties of the Commission in respect to the purchase, construction, maintenance, operation, repair, and insurance of the bridge or bridges, the conservation and application of all funds, the security for the payment of the bonds, the safeguarding of money on hand or on deposit, and the rights and remedies of said trustee and the holders of the bonds, restricting the individual right of action of the bondholders as is customary in trust agreements respecting bonds of corporations. Such trust agreement may contain such provisions for protecting and enforcing the rights and remedies of the trustee and the bondholders as may be reasonable and proper and not inconsistent with the law.

The bridge or bridges purchased or constructed under the authority of the act shall be deemed to be Federal instrumentalities for interstate commerce, the Postal Service, and military and other purposes authorized by the Government of the United States, and said bridge or bridges and the bonds issued in connection therewith and the income derived therefrom shall be exempt from all Federal, State, municipal, and local taxation. Said bonds shall be sold in such manner and at such time or times and at such price as the Commission may determine, but no such sale shall be made at a price so low as to require the payment of more than 6-percent interest on the money received therefor, computed with relation to the absolute maturity of the bonds in accordance with standard tables of bond values, and the face amount thereof shall be so calculated as to produce, at the price of their sale, the cost of the bridge or bridges, acquired and/or constructed, and approaches and the land, easements, and appurtenances used in connection therewith when added to any other funds made available to the Commission for the use of said purposes. The cost of the bridge or bridges acquired hereunder and the cost of the bridge to be constructed as provided herein, together with approaches and approach highways, shall be deemed to include interest during construction of the said bridge, and for 12 months thereafter, and all engineering, legal, architectural, traffic-surveying, and other expenses incident to the construction of the bridge and the acquisition of the necessary property, incident to the financing thereof, including the cost of acquiring existing franchises, riparian rights, plans, and works of and relating to the bridge or bridges now owned by any person, firm, or corporation, and the cost of purchasing all or any part of the shares of stock of any such corporate owner, or by conveyance from such corporation, if, in the judgment of the Commission, such purchases should be found expedient. If the proceeds of the bonds issued shall exceed the cost as finally determined, the excess shall be placed in the sinking fund hereinafter provided. Prior to the preparation of definite bonds the Commission may, under like restrictions, issue temporary bonds or interim certificates, with or without coupons, of any denomination whatsoever, exchangeable for definite bonds when such bonds that have been executed are available for delivery.

Sec. 5. In fixing the rates of toll to be charged for the use of such bridge or bridges, in accordance with the act of Congress approved March 23, 1906, the same shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund sufficient to pay for the reasonable cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge or bridges and approaches under economical management, and to provide a sinking fund sufficient to pay the principal and interest of such bonds as the same shall fall due and the redemption or repurchase price

of all or any thereof redeemed or repurchased before maturity as herein provided. All tolls and other revenues from said bridge or bridges are hereby pledged to such uses and to the application thereof as hereinafter in this section required. After payment or provision for payment therefrom of all such cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating and the reservation of an amount of money estimated to be sufficient for the same purpose during an ensuing period of not more than 6 months, the remainder of tolls collected shall be placed in the sinking fund, at intervals to be determined by the Commission prior to the issuance of the bonds. An accurate record of the cost of the bridge or bridges and approaches; the expenditures for maintaining, repairing, and operating the same; and of the daily tolls collected, shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested. The Commission shall classify in a reasonable way all traffic over the bridge or bridges so that the tolls shall be so fixed and adjusted by it as to be uniform in the application thereof to all traffic falling within reasonable classes, regardless of the status or character of any person, firm, or corporation participating in such traffic, and shall prevent all use of such bridge or bridges for traffic except upon payment of tolls so fixed and adjusted. No toll shall be charged officials or employees of the Commission, nor shall toll be charged officials of the Government of the United States while in the discharge of duties incident to their office or employment, nor shall toll be charged members of the fire department or peace officers when engaged in the performance of their official duties.

Within a reasonable time after the construction of any bridge or bridges, or the purchase of any bridge or bridges, the Commission shall file with the Bureau of Public Roads of the United States Department of Agriculture a sworn itemized statement showing the cost of constructing or purchasing the bridge or bridges and their approaches, the cost of acquiring any interest in real or other property necessary therefor, and the amount of bonds, debentures, or other evidence of indebtedness issued in connection with the construction or purchase of said bridge or bridges.

Sec. 6. Nothing herein contained shall require the Commission or its successors to maintain or operate any bridge or bridges purchased hereunder, if and when all bonds issued for account of such bridge or bridges shall have been retired or provision for the payment of interest on and retirement of such bonds from the revenues from any other bridge or bridges shall have been made at the time of issuance of such bonds. Any bridge or bridges so purchased, with appurtenances and property thereto connected and belonging, may be sold or otherwise disposed of or may be abandoned or dismantled whenever in the judgment of the Commission or its successors, and subject to the approval of the Chief of the Bureau of Public Roads, United States Department of Agriculture, and the United States Secretary of War, it may be declared expedient so to do, and provisions with respect to and regulating any such sale, disposal, abandonment, or dismantlement may be included in proceedings for the issuance and sale of bonds for account of any such bridge or bridges. The Commission and its successors may fix such rates of toll for the use of such bridge or bridges as it may deem proper, subject to the same conditions as are hereinabove required as to tolls for traffic over the bridge to be constructed provided tolls shall be fixed and revised from time to time for traffic over all bridges so as not to adversely reflect upon the earnings of any bridge or bridges for account of which bonds may be outstanding. An accurate record of the cost of purchasing or constructing each such bridge; the expenditures for maintaining, repairing, and operating the same; and of the daily tolls collected shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested.

Sec. 7. After payment of the bonds and interest, or after a sinking fund sufficient for such payment shall have been provided and shall be held for that purpose, the Commission shall deliver deeds or other suitable instruments of conveyance of the interest of the Commission in and to the bridge or bridges extending between the State of Iowa and the State of Illinois, that part of said bridge or bridges within Iowa to the State of Iowa or any municipality or agency thereof as may be authorized by or pursuant to law to accept the same (hereafter referred to as the "Iowa interests") and that part of said bridge or bridges within Illinois to the State of Illinois or any municipality or agency thereof as may be authorized by or pursuant to law to accept the same (hereinafter referred to as the "Illinois interests"); likewise the Commission shall deliver deeds or other suitable instruments of conveyance of the interest of the Commission in and to any bridge that may cross the Mississippi River between the city of Dubuque, Iowa, and the State of Wisconsin, that part of said bridge within Iowa to the State of Iowa or any municipality or agency thereof as may be authorized by or pursuant to law to accept the same (hereafter referred to as the "Iowa interests"), and that part of said bridge within Wisconsin to the State of Wisconsin or any municipality or agency thereof as may be authorized by or pursuant to law to accept the same (hereafter referred to as the "Wisconsin interests"), under the condition that the bridge or bridges shall thereafter be free of tolls and be properly maintained, operated, and repaired by the Iowa interests, the Illinois interests, and the Wisconsin interests, as may be agreed upon; but if the Iowa, Illinois, or Wisconsin interests, as the case may be, fail to accept, or are not authorized to accept, their respective portions of said bridge or bridges, then the Commission may deliver deeds, or other suitable instruments or conveyance of said portions,

to any other interest which may accept and may be authorized to accept the same, under the condition that the bridge or bridges shall thereafter be free of toll and be properly maintained, operated, and repaired by said interests to whom said conveyances are delivered; but if either the Iowa interests or the Illinois interests or the Wisconsin interests, or any other interest hereinabove mentioned, shall not be authorized to accept or shall not accept the same under such conditions, then the bridge or bridges shall continue to be owned, maintained, operated, and repaired by the Commission, and the rates of tolls shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund of not to exceed the amount necessary for the proper maintenance, repair, and operation of the bridge or bridges and approaches under economical management, until such time as the Iowa interests, the Illinois interests, the Wisconsin interests, or any other interest hereinabove mentioned, shall be authorized to accept and shall accept such conveyance under such conditions. The rate or rates of toll for crossing any bridge now existing or hereafter constructed which abuts upon or enters into the corporate limits of the city of Dubuque, Iowa, shall not be reduced below the rate or rates now in effect on existing bridges so long as any indebtedness of said Commission for the account of any bridge or bridges shall be outstanding and unpaid.

(a) Notwithstanding any restrictions or limitation imposed by the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, or by the Federal Highway Act, or by an act amendatory of or supplemental to either thereof, the Secretary of Agriculture or any other Federal department or agency of the United States Government may extend Federal aid under such acts for the construction of said bridge or bridges out of any moneys allocated to the State of Iowa with the consent of the State highway commission of said State, and out of moneys allocated to the State of Illinois with the consent of the department of highways of said State.

Sec. 8. For the purpose of carrying into effect the objects stated in this act, there is hereby created the City of Dubuque Bridge Commission, and by that name, style, and title said body shall have perpetual succession; may contract and be contracted with, sue and be sued, implead and be impleaded, complain and defend in all courts of law and equity; may make and have a common seal; may purchase or otherwise acquire and hold or dispose of real estate and other property; may accept and receive donations or gifts of money or property and apply same to the purposes of this act; and shall have and possess all powers necessary, convenient, or proper for carrying into effect the objects stated in this act.

The Commission shall consist of W. M. Clemens, Charles G. Kretschmer, Charles T. Landon, Thomas M. Stampfer, of Dubuque, Iowa, and R. E. Werner, of East Dubuque, Ill.; such Commission shall be a public body corporate and politic. Each member of the Commission shall qualify within 30 days after the approval of this act by filing in the office of the Secretary of Agriculture an oath that he will faithfully perform the duties imposed upon him by this act, and each person appointed to fill a vacancy shall qualify in like manner within 30 days after his appointment. Any vacancy occurring in said Commission by reason of failure to qualify as above provided, or by reason of death or resignation, shall be filled by the Secretary of Agriculture. Before the issuance of bonds as hereinabove provided, each member of the Commission shall give such bond as may be fixed by the Chief of the Bureau of Public Roads of the Department of Agriculture, conditioned upon the faithful performance of all duties required by this act, the cost of such surety prior to and during the construction of the bridge shall be paid or reimbursed from the bond proceeds and thereafter such costs shall be deemed an operating expense. The Commission shall elect a chairman and a vice chairman from its members, and may establish rules and regulations for the government of its own business. A majority of the members shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.

Sec. 9. The Commission shall have no capital stock or shares of interest or participation, and all revenues and receipts thereof shall be applied to the purposes specified in this act. The members of the Commission shall be entitled to a per diem compensation for their services of \$10 for each day actually spent in the business of the Commission, but the maximum compensation of the chairman in any year shall not exceed \$1,200, and of each other member shall not exceed \$600. The members of the Commission shall also be entitled to receive traveling-expense allowance of 10 cents a mile for each mile actually traveled on the business of the Commission. The Commission may employ a secretary, treasurer, engineers, attorneys, and other such experts, assistants, and employees as they may deem necessary, who shall be entitled to receive such compensation as the Commission may determine. All salaries and expenses shall be paid solely from the funds provided under the authority of this act. After all bonds and interest thereon shall have been paid and all other obligations of the Commission paid or discharged, or provision for all such payment shall have been made as hereinbefore provided and after the bridge or bridges shall have been conveyed to the Iowa interests, the Illinois interests and the Wisconsin interests, as herein provided, or otherwise disposed of as provided herein, the Commission shall be dissolved and shall cease to have further existence by an order of the Chief of the Bureau of Public Roads made upon his own initiative or upon application of the Commission or any member or members thereof, but only after a public hearing in the city of

Dubuque, Iowa, notice of the time and place of which hearing and the purpose thereof shall have been published once, at least 30 days before the date thereof, in a newspaper published in the city of Dubuque, Iowa. At the time of such dissolution all moneys in the hands of or to the credit of the Commission shall be divided and distribution made between the interests of the States, as may be determined by the Chief of the Bureau of Public Roads of the United States.

SEC. 10. Notwithstanding any of the provisions of this act, the Commission shall have full power and authority to negotiate and enter into a contract or contracts with the State Highway Commission of Iowa and the Department of Highways of Illinois, the State Highway Department of Wisconsin, the city of Dubuque, Dubuque County, Iowa, or any county or municipality in the State of Illinois, whereby the Commission may receive financial aid in the construction or maintenance of a bridge or bridges and approaches thereto, and said Commission in its discretion may avail itself of all of the facilities of the State Highway Commission of the State of Iowa and the Department of Highways of the State of Illinois with regard to the construction of said proposed bridge or bridges, and the Commission may make and enter into any contract or contracts which it deems expedient and proper with the State Highway Commission of Iowa and the Department of Highways of Illinois, whereby said highway departments or either of them may construct, operate, and maintain or participate with the Commission in the construction, operation, maintenance of said bridge or bridges to be constructed hereunder, and approaches. It is hereby declared to be the purpose of Congress to facilitate the construction of a bridge and proper approaches across the Mississippi River at or near Dubuque, Iowa, and East Dubuque, Ill., and to authorize the Commission to promote said object and purposes, with full power to contract with either the State Highway Commission of Iowa or the Department of Highways of Illinois or with any agency or department of the Federal Government, or both, in relation to the purchase or condemnation, construction, operation, and maintenance of said bridges and approaches.

SEC. 11. Nothing herein contained shall be construed to authorize or permit the Commission or any member thereof to create any obligation or incur any liability other than such obligations and liabilities as are dischargeable solely from funds contemplated to be provided by this act. No obligation created or liability incurred pursuant to this act shall be a personal obligation or liability of any member or members of the Commission but shall be chargeable solely to the funds herein provided, nor shall any indebtedness created pursuant to this act be an indebtedness of the United States.

SEC. 12. The design and construction of any bridge which may be built pursuant to this act shall be in accordance with the standard specifications for highway bridges adopted by the American Association of State Highway Officials.

SEC. 13. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, May 27, 1938, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate Thursday, May 26 (legislative day of April 20), 1938

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Richmond B. Keech, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia for a term of 3 years from July 1, 1938. (Reappointment.)

COAST GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE ENSIGNS, TO RANK FROM JUNE 2, 1938

Alexander William Wuerker	James Anderson Hyslop
John Edward Dale Hudgens	Benjamin Dey Shoemaker, Jr.
Arthur Pfeiffer	
George Edward Howarth	Raymond Allen Tuttle
Benjamin Franklin Engel	Donald Marcus Morell
Robert Waldron	Charles Eugene Leising, Jr.
George Thomas Murati	Benjamin Palmer Clark
James Weldon Williams	Thomas Reece Sargent, III
Henry Parsons Kniskern, Jr.	John A. Pritchard, Jr.
Cornelius Garret Houtsma	Edwin Bruce Ing
Edward Carlton Allen, Jr.	Winslow Hurlburt Buxton
Arthur Bright Engel	James Baird Weaver

LXXXIII—477

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO FIELD ARTILLERY

Second Lt. Carl Baehr, Jr., Cavalry, with rank from June 12, 1936, effective June 12, 1938.

TO COAST ARTILLERY CORPS

Second Lt. Laurence John Ellert, Air Corps, with rank from June 12, 1936.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 26 (legislative day of April 20), 1938

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

William Ryan to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Illinois.

COAST GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE ENSIGNS, TO RANK FROM JUNE 2, 1938

Alexander William Wuerker
John Edward Dale Hudgens
Arthur Pfeiffer
George Edward Howarth
Benjamin Franklin Engel
Robert Waldron
George Thomas Murati
James Weldon Williams
Henry Parsons Kniskern, Jr.
Cornelius Garret Houtsma
Edward Carlton Allen, Jr.
Arthur Bright Engel
James Anderson Hyslop
Benjamin Dey Shoemaker, Jr.
Raymond Allen Tuttle
Donald Marcus Morell
Charles Eugene Leising, Jr.
Benjamin Palmer Clark
Thomas Reece Sargent III
John A. Pritchard, Jr.
Edwin Bruce Ing
Winslow Hurlburt Buxton
James Baird Weaver

POSTMASTERS

CALIFORNIA

Mary D. Briggs, Los Angeles.
Hyle W. Rapp, Loyalton.

GEORGIA

Marion Lucas, Savannah.

NORTH DAKOTA

Orpheus H. Halverson, Northwood.
Sadie E. Uggen, Woodworth.

WEST VIRGINIA

Ada B. Steiner, Berkeley Springs.
James H. Moyer, Cass.
Thomas R. Moore, Charles Town.
John W. Fisher, Moorfield.
Frederick W. Horschler, Newburg.

WISCONSIN

Albert Hess, Arcadia.
John F. Loschky, Arpin.
Theodore E. Wozniak, Athens.
Charles P. McCormick, Belleville.
Edward R. Kranzfelder, Bloomer.
George Heiderer, Butternut.
Alex G. Mohr, Cambria.
John S. McHugh, De Pere.
August H. LaRenzie, Eagle River.
Ronald F. North, Eau Claire.
Tessa B. Morrissy, Elkhorn.
Melvin I. Dunn, Fall River.
Fern M. Dagnon, Ferryville.
Claude E. Rochon, Florence.

Matthew J. Hart, Glidden.
 Reginald L. Barnes, Greenwood.
 James R. Alexander, Hayward.
 Carl J. Mueller, Jefferson.
 Frank Heppe, Kewaskum.
 Wenzel M. Dvorak, La Crosse.
 Frank M. Doyle, Ladysmith.
 May K. Powers, Lake Geneva.
 Walter E. Smith, Lodi.
 Ruth S. Foley, Maiden Rock.
 Thomas F. McDonald, Marshfield.
 John K. Wotruba, Milladore.
 Roswell S. Richards, Monticello.
 Axel L. Olson, Mountain.
 Nicholas Abler, Mount Calvary.
 Lillian N. Hughes, New Richmond.
 John W. Johnson, Pepin.
 Rudolph I. Baumann, Phillips.
 John P. Pabst, Pittsville.
 Louis H. Schultz, Reedsburg.
 Adelbert O. Randall, Rosendale.
 William J. Corry, South Milwaukee.
 Louis J. Thompson, Spooner.
 John C. Reinke, Stone Lake.
 Bethel W. Robinson, Superior.
 Alfred H. Hadler, Thiensville.
 William S. Wagner, Thorp.
 Louis H. Rivard, Turtle Lake.
 Elmer A. Peterson, Walworth.
 John T. O'Sullivan, Washburn.
 Edward A. Peters, Waterloo.
 James W. Carew, Waupaca.
 Frank P. McManman, Wisconsin Dells.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 26, 1938

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, who art the hope of all the ends of the earth, remember us in love and guide us by Thine infinite wisdom. Grant Thy blessing upon these Thy servants of our Republic. Clothe them with the spirit of wisdom and truth. So rule in all hearts and so bless us in all endeavors that justice and contentment may prevail. We pray, so purify our spiritual visions that we may see Thee; renew our inward lives through the unseen and eternal. O Thou whose nature is love, whose spirit is goodness, whose will is peace, make Thy face to shine upon us and be gracious unto us. Oh, lift up Thy countenance upon us that we may see the glowing pathways of righteous duty and service. In the holy name of Jesus. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. St. Claire, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 647. Joint resolution to increase by \$15,000 the amount authorized to be appropriated for the observance of the anniversary of the adoption of the Ordinance of 1787 and the settlement of the Northwest Territory.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. TRUMAN a member of the committee of conference on the part of the Senate on the bill (S. 3845) to create a Civil Aeronautics Authority, and to promote the development and safety and to provide for the regulation of civil aeronautics, vice Mr. CLARK, resigned.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House. A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 90]

Anderson, Mo.	Dirksen	Lambeth	Secrest
Andrews	Ditter	Lesinski	Shafer, Mich.
Arnold	Dockweller	Lucas	Shanley
Atkinson	Doughton	McGranery	Sirovich
Barden	Douglas	McGroarty	Smith, Maine
Binderup	Drew, Pa.	McMillan	Smith, Okla.
Bland	Elliott	Maas	Somers, N. Y.
Boehne	Flah	Magnuson	Steagall
Boren	Fitzpatrick	Martin, Mass.	Sullivan
Buckley, N. Y.	Gasque	Mitchell, Tenn.	Taylor, Colo.
Bulwinkle	Gifford	Norton	Thurston
Byrne	Gildea	O'Connell, R. I.	Tinkham
Cannon, Wis.	Goldsborough	O'Connor, Mont.	Vincent, Ky.
Champion	Gray, Ind.	O'Day	Vinson, Ga.
Chapman	Gray, Pa.	Oliver	Wallgren
Claypool	Greenwood	Palmisano	Wearin
Cole, Md.	Griswold	Pettengill	Weaver
Cole, N. Y.	Hancock, N. C.	Polk	Wene
Creal	Hart	Quinn	Whelchel
Crosby	Hoffman	Ramspeck	White, Idaho
Culkin	Holmes	Reece, Tenn.	Wilcox
Curley	Hook	Rich	Wolcott
Daly	Hunter	Richards	Woodruff
Deen	Kennedy, Md.	Rogers, Okla.	
Delaney	Kniffin	Sadowski	
DeMuth	Kvale	Scott	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 324 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

WAR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILLS, 1939

Mr. SNYDER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill (H. R. 9995) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and for other purposes, and on the bill (H. R. 10291) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

WHAT IS WRONG WITH WALL STREET?

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point on What Is Wrong With Wall Street?

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Speaker, in these days of depressed financial conditions it is indeed refreshing to learn of at least one Wall Street banker who is not discouraged, but on the contrary highly pleased with the program enacted by Congress in the last few years which is designed to curb dishonesty and greedy speculation in the capital markets.

I refer to John J. Bergen, a youthful Wall Street underwriter whose courage, foresight, and tenacity in this period of stress are indeed edifying and encouraging to the observer. I have never met Mr. Bergen. I know him only through his intimates.

From these people I learn that Mr. Bergen foresaw that the old Wall Street, its traditions, its methods of doing business, some of its personnel, and its reactionary attitude toward changing social conditions were fast crumbling. Did Mr. Bergen sit idly by, criticizing and condemning the Democratic Party and this Congress and the Securities Exchange Commission for alleged ineptitude? Did his wails resound through these walls? Did he lament the passage of the so-called lush days, when almost any man of integrity and energy could amass a fortune? He most certainly did not.

Mr. Bergen changed the entire structure of his widespread banking interests. He kept pace with our changing times and conditions. He studied regulations of the Securities and Exchange Commission and framed his banking structure to meet its requirements, despite many difficulties in attempting to follow out Securities and Exchange Commission regulations. The result has been, I understand from those who

know him, that Mr. Bergen's banking interests have been more prosperous than ever. Here was a man who knew the sting of early defeat; a man who had struggled for every penny he ever earned, making a financial comeback when banking houses all about him were tumbling with distressing rapidity.

Mr. Bergen is still a young man. Well might the bankers of this country look to him for guidance and leadership. He did not balk at regulation of his profession. He threw his books open to S. E. C. He abided by its regulations, according to their interpretation of the acts of Congress, a course which frequently brought hardships. He cast aside old-time worn-out banking methods in favor of progressive ideas. He was the pioneer in new ways of supplying industry with much-needed capital. John J. Bergen should rightfully be called the Lindbergh of Wall Street.

What is wrong with Wall Street? On the answer to that question hinges the prosperity of a whole Nation, for Wall Street seems to be the financial bellwether, leading the country along the path of prosperity when the market is good and taking us along the road of depression when the market tumbles.

Some bankers have told me that nothing is wrong with Wall Street but that the fault lies with so-called Wall Street leaders who, set in their ways, refuse to acknowledge the trend of changing times and methods for financing industry. They are attempting to merchandise capital through avenues and by means of methods that have long been outmoded. That seems to be one of the few important professions that refuses to see the light of day and to set its house in order accordingly.

Let us suppose the medical profession or the legal profession held to theories and practices of 100 years ago. Would we have made progress? Would we have healthier families? Would we have the efficient court systems we see everywhere in this country today? We would not. Let us suppose the railroads continued to operate with outmoded equipment, telephone and telegraph communication had not been perfected, or the sugar refiners still brought sugar to the corner grocery store in barrels where it was sold by the old hand-rolled cone method. It is not difficult to visualize what a multiplicity of such examples would mean to a country, the very foundation of which has been progressive change for more than 150 years. Wall Street alone seems to have feared change. It seems that this vast financial sector of the country still dreams and works in the atmosphere of 1890.

We Americans have been universally recognized and lauded for the rapid strides we have made in technological developments. We have set the pace for many countries of the world in all types of engineering, medicine, law, and contemporary intellectual advancement. We have invariably been the first to discard the obsolete; to reverse methods in favor of more efficient and cheaper production so that all the people might enjoy the good things of life. Even our courts have kept stride with the times by reversing previous decisions in favor of changing social and economic conditions. Progress is based on change without which there can be no progress. Without change there can be only stagnation and decay.

I believe it is because Wall Street clings so tenaciously to the old order of doing things that there has been stagnation in the capital markets in which there should be nothing but liquidity if a country is to survive. Wall Street has an important place in our economic set-up. Banking institutions there and the men at the head of them perform services of inestimable value, but a good part of their functions becomes nullified in a period of financial decadence such as we are now experiencing. Wall Street must look to new methods for conducting its business and employ methods embraced within the frame of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

The Securities and Exchange Commission, of course, is not perfect. I believe with our President that time will perfect that machinery. But at least it is a good start in the right direction. There seems to be some misapprehension in Wall Street concerning interpretations of the Securities and Ex-

change Commission. Banking houses say they are under mental strain because of a conflict in interpreting Securities and Exchange Commission regulations, but all this, I feel sure, will be cleared up with the passage of time.

Meanwhile, Wall Street might well follow the lead of John J. Bergen, a youthful banker who believes our present form of democracy is not incompatible with keeping liquid the capital markets of a great nation. He has shown the way toward governmental cooperation. He has prospered because he had the vision to see that intelligent change is preferable to stagnation and financial "blues crying." Let Wall Street look around for leaders like this man.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BILL

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 3845) to create a Civil Aeronautics Authority, and to promote the development and safety and to provide for the regulation of civil aeronautics, with a House amendment, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. LEA, CROSSER, BULWINKLE, EICHER, HOLMES, and WADSWORTH.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon about 100 Members of the House listened to a very enlightening address delivered by our colleague the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BINDERUP] on the question of monetary control. I call attention to the fact that the gentleman has obtained permission to speak for 30 minutes on each of 4 consecutive days, in which speeches he will tell us other things about the fundamentals of monetary control. I bespeak for him the continued interest of the Members.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one-half minute to make an announcement.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce to the House that the Select Committee Investigating the Tennessee Valley Authority is now holding hearings in the Senate Office Building. The House members of that committee, Messrs. MEAD, THOMASON of Texas, WOLVERTON, JENKINS of Ohio, and myself, are attending these meetings during the sessions of the House. I make this announcement in order that the RECORD may reflect the fact of our absence and the duties in which we are engaged.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REILLY asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Speaker, a great deal has been said about the attitude of labor in its respect for the National Industrial Labor Relations Board's decisions, and about labor's attitude in complying with regulations. I bring to the attention of the House a situation that has developed recently in my State wherein the Bigelow Carpet Manufacturing Co., of Amsterdam, prior to the termination of its contract with the workers, and without the formality of negotiations, broke the contract, reduced the wages of the workers, and forced what is from all appearances a lockout in that manufacturing center. The chamber of commerce,

the newspapers, and everybody else there, I am informed, seem to sympathize with the workers. That company, however, has steadfastly refused to comply with the regulation to submit to established principles of law or to negotiate with its workers.

I point out that at this critical period of our country's history, when compliance and cooperation of every element of our citizenship is required in order that we may solve our problems, this ought to be noted and placed in the RECORD. That organization should be censured and disciplined for public information.

STATEMENT WITH REFERENCE TO THE BIGELOW SANFORD CARPET CO. STRIKE

The Bigelow Sanford Carpet Co. is one of the three largest companies in America in that industry. It employs 6,000 persons out of a total of 30,000 persons in the carpet and rug industry, most of which is located in New York State. Its annual sales approximate \$30,000,000, out of a total of \$125,000,000 for the entire industry.

The company has two plants of equal size, each employing about 3,000 persons. One is located at Amsterdam, N. Y., and the other at Thompsonville, Conn.

Specific agreements exist at the Amsterdam plant, but only a verbal understanding exists at the Thompsonville branch.

I am informed that the company announced that they would put a wage reduction into effect on Monday, May 9. They notified the local unions, and would not negotiate the issue. After this refusal the locals met and decided to attempt to negotiate with the company. They agreed that if the company refused to rescind the wage cut the employees' committee would be empowered to call a strike.

The employees' committee met in New York on Monday, May 9, the day that the wage reduction went into effect. They called on the company officers and urged them to rescind the wage reduction and to bargain collectively with the workers, and, if necessary, to submit the question to arbitration. The company refused to bargain or to arbitrate and declared the decision of the management could not be reviewed; it was final.

The result was that on the following Tuesday meetings were called by the locals and the strike began on Wednesday. Both plants are completely shut down. Local merchants have petitioned the company to settle the issue, but the company has refused to even arbitrate. The town and local governments have cooperated with the strikers. In Thompsonville the strikers have been deputized. Even the reactionary papers have referred to the strikes as "ideal" because of the orderliness with which they are being conducted. Nevertheless, temper is rising daily because the local managements are antagonistic and are issuing vituperative statements.

Simultaneously the unions started court action to enjoin the company from violating the agreements that existed. Through court maneuvers the company has succeeded in delaying the hearings, even though they failed to have the issue thrown out of court.

The unions have also filed charges against the company for violation of the National Labor Relations Act.

A complaint against the Bigelow Sanford Carpet Co. was filed with Mrs. Elinore M. Herrick, director of the New York State division of the National Labor Relations Board. This is another step taken by the employees in their effort to compel this company to observe its obligation of collective bargaining with the organized workers of Amsterdam and Thompsonville concerning the 10-percent wage reduction which was instituted by the company. The union has demanded the restoration of the 10 percent and immediate collective bargaining concerning the wage question. The workers declare that they want "negotiation, conciliation, arbitration the American way." The company simply refuses to negotiate.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include two short tables covering expenditures, tax receipts, and so forth, having to do with fiscal affairs.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and insert therein a speech I made at Bennington, Vt., on last Sunday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

THE LATE HENRY R. GIBSON

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the morning newspapers today carry the sad intelligence that at his home on yesterday the Honorable Henry R. Gibson, a former Member of this body, at the ripe old age of 101 years passed to the Great Beyond.

Judge Gibson, as he was familiarly known, was a predecessor of mine, having represented the Second District of Tennessee for a period of 10 years, entering this body on March 4, 1895, and voluntarily retiring on the 4th day of March 1905. Judge Gibson rendered an unusual and outstanding public service. Few men possessed such a versatility of talent. He was a soldier, lawyer, jurist, author, and statesman, and he exhibited extraordinary ability in every capacity in which he served.

His Gibson Suits in Chancery is a masterpiece on legal jurisprudence. This work has been translated into many languages, and is used as a textbook at Yale and other American institutions. Every lawyer in Tennessee will proudly acknowledge that this volume on chancery practice is absolutely indispensable, and I understand it is used extensively by members of the bar in many other States. His last legal contribution was a codification of the laws of Alaska, which I understand is now in general use in that far-away northwest Territory. Judge Gibson was the last member of the Tennessee Constitutional Convention of 1876 to pass away. As a testimonial and in recognition of his valuable contribution to the legal lore of the Volunteer State, the Legislature of Tennessee some time ago adopted a joint resolution to that effect, which was written on parchment and transmitted to the now deceased.

Judge Gibson was a man of impeccable integrity. In his public career he displayed the courage of the cavalier, and his private life was the essence of rectitude and chastity.

Mr. Speaker, the people of my district and the State of Tennessee are proud of the contribution this distinguished man made to his State and to his country.

When Judge Gibson retired from Congress he took up his residence in Washington, and continued to reside here until his death. He remained here in order to be near the great libraries of the National Capital, where he carried on extensive research.

He leaves a widow by a second marriage and two daughters by his former marriage, the daughters being Mrs. Joe T. Brownlee and Mrs. Walter Wells, both of whom reside in the city of Washington. [Applause.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, many Members of the House have expressed deep interest in my efforts on behalf of securing an investigation of radio monopoly and the Federal Communications Commission. This morning I had the privilege of appearing before the Rules Committee to request such investigation. I am very hopeful that we may be successful in our effort to secure an investigation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point the statement I made before the Rules Committee this morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The statement follows:

THE NEED FOR AN INVESTIGATION OF THE RADIO MONOPOLY

1. Proven inefficiency of the Commission to protect the public.
2. Existence of a dangerous radio monopoly which has been promoted and protected by some members of the Commission.
3. The broadcasting of indecent, profane, and obnoxious radio programs, with little or no action on the part of the Commission.
4. Broadcasters challenging the honesty of elected officials, such as alleging that votes of the members of a legislative body can be bought for \$100 down to a pound of tea, without any action on the part of the Commission.
5. No apparent effort on the part of the Commission to insure the carrying out of the Communications Act wherein licensees hold and secure renewal of licenses only when public interest, convenience, or necessity is served.

The Communications Act of 1934, under which the Communications Commission operates, requires (sec. 307) that radio licensees serve public interest, convenience, and necessity. Law further requires that before license can be renewed, Commission must certify that public interest, convenience, or necessity is being served (sec. 309).

Commissioner Sykes testified before House Appropriations Committee that renewal of license is perfunctory and a clerical performance despite the law, which reads as follows:

"SEC. 309. (a) If upon examination of any application for a station license or for the renewal or modification of a station license the Commission shall determine that public interest, convenience, or necessity would be served by the granting thereof, it shall authorize the issuance, renewal, or modification thereof in accordance with said finding."

Commissioner Sykes' testimony was as follows:

"Mr. WOODRUM. To what extent do they (licenses) have to be reconsidered? Is it a perfunctory proposition, unless there are some charges made?"

"Mr. SYKES. Yes."

"Mr. WOODRUM. So far as the application is concerned, if there are no charges, it is merely a clerical operation?"

"Mr. SYKES. Yes."

(From p. 365, 1938 House appropriations hearings.)

Public interest, which the Congress specifically sought to serve and protect, cannot be served by those licensees residing thousands of miles away from the community served by their radio station when they have no interest or even knowledge of the needs of those communities. The radio monopoly, carrying chain programs duplicated in almost every area, serving sometimes a hundred or more stations, naturally can offer a more attractive program than the submerged little station which honestly seeks to serve the people of its community.

The Commission in granting licenses has taken into consideration not whether the applicant can or will serve public interest, but, in the main, will the radio station be profitable? A few weeks ago the head of the radio monopoly, Mr. Sarnoff, addressed a meeting and his speech was printed in a 15-page booklet. Nowhere in the book will you find where he contended that his company was serving public interest, convenience, or necessity. His whole motive was profits.

The inefficiency or lack of interest on the part of the Commission as to whether the law is being carried out and whether or not radio stations are serving public interest, convenience, or necessity, deprives local people from being able to secure radio licenses to serve their home communities because almost every desirable wave length of high power has been gobbled up by the National Broadcasting Co., the Columbia, the Mutual, and their affiliates.

Stations have put on indecent and obnoxious radio programs. I have many complaints of blood-curdling children's programs such as Dick Tracy, Lone Ranger, Gang Busters, and others of the same kind which the writers claim are a menace to the children of our Nation. Other programs have been put on which are so indecent that, following my talks with leaders of the House, I have decided they are not fit for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. One of these programs is so indecent that even listing the characters named in the program, to my mind, would be obnoxious. Yet this program, and presumably others of its kind, were broadcast into thousands of unsuspecting American homes.

In at least one case, even with a sworn-to transcription of this program on file with the Commission with a formal complaint, no action has been taken by the Commission as a whole other than to renew the license.

A few years ago a station on the Pacific coast, KNX, was cited for 44 violations of the law in 1 day. The employee of the Commission who built up this case, presumably in the public interest, was rewarded by the Commission by being demoted. The owner of the station, realizing he was in trouble, sold his station to the Columbia for one and one-quarter million dollars. What went with the sale of the radio license is hard to ascertain, as Columbia has built its own studios and its own transmitter. This radio frequency or license which was sold to Columbia for one and one-

quarter million dollars, plus a commission of \$100,000 to a radio broker, cost the seller nothing other than his investment of some \$200,000. In other words, a Government franchise was sold to one of the monopoly group for something more than a million dollars, out of which the Government received nothing.

It is charged that radio stations have indulged in political activities, using the facilities of their stations and the services of their employees to defeat Congressmen and other public officials seeking reelection, without any reprimand on the part of the Commission. This can happen to any member of this committee or any Member of the House.

There is on file in the Commission a sworn complaint made by a former employee of a radio station in Boston that the station used its facilities and the personal service of its paid employees in an effort to defeat my late brother, "Billy" Connery. This was carried on without the slightest knowledge on our part and I only learned of it on April 1 of this year, after this sworn complaint had been filed with the Commission.

This station, according to this sworn statement, financed the Republican candidate's campaign. Its employees are alleged to have prepared the speeches of my brother's Republican opponent and the station is said to have entered into fake contracts to pretend that the Republican candidate was paying for the radio time which he used. The so-called editorial page of this radio station was allegedly used to promote the campaign of the Republican candidate while at the same time denouncing my brother's character as well as his Democracy.

This same radio-station owner, who, I understand, under one name or another, holds nine radio licenses, permitted his so-called editorial commentator to allege that any member of the Massachusetts Legislature could be purchased for something between a pound of tea and a hundred dollars.

This same radio licensee permitted such vulgar and malicious utterances over his station last November and December that a responsible Boston daily Democratic newspaper described these broadcasters in an editorial as "The hatchet men of the air."

That the radio monopoly controls the activities of some members of the Commission is general talk. Any time a question comes up which concerns the National Broadcasting Co. Commissioner Brown is said to be very active and credited with taking very good care of their interest, while when a matter comes before the Commission concerning the Columbia Broadcasting Co. Commissioner Sykes is said to be very active in their behalf.

Some months ago two lawyers specializing in radio matters were brought before the Commission for disbarment for, let us say, unethical practice, to put it mildly. One of these lawyers was reprimanded for tampering with the files, while the other was suspended for 60 days. The suspended lawyer's defense was that what he was charged with was common practice, and, strange as it might seem, the Commission has never made an inquiry to ascertain whether or not his sworn contention that that for which he was disbarred for 2 months was common practice before the Commission.

An additional reason for this investigation is the arrogance shown in these subsidized publications supported by the radio monopoly.

I hold here a copy of a subsidized publication, allegedly, as the title states, covering the communications industry and claiming to be an authentic record of Congress, which has deliberately distorted even the contents of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

On page 21 I find that on May 6 I am credited with assailing Commissioner Craven, when the printed facts are that I made no mention of him, directly or indirectly. I did, however, without the slightest concealment, criticize Chairman McNinch at that time.

A more subtle form of propaganda in behalf of the radio monopoly, printed possibly in return for one of the \$40,000 advertisements of R. C. A. in one of the Time magazines, appears in Time in its issue of May 16. In this issue we find the black flag of bigotry raised anew from whence it generally originates, namely, Wall Street. Apparently the financiers controlling this publication believe the time has arrived for the return of bigotry and intolerance, and this sheet has decided to become a spokesman for the bigots and the intolerants of the present day.

While we find more than 20 names referred to in this story, in only one instance do we find the religion of anyone mentioned, derisively, and that happens to be myself. I have no hesitancy in proclaiming that I am a Catholic and that I detest bigotry and intolerance.

Chairman McNinch, who is honored by this publication by having his picture on the front page and whom the subsidized publication seeks to protect from criticism, deserted the Democratic Party in 1928, was honored by Hoover in 1930, and unless he is willing to plead guilty to being an ingrate could hardly say that he supported Roosevelt in 1932 and 1936.

The public interest should be protected and those radio stations which are serving public interest should not be made to suffer because of the actions of the radio monopoly or the apparent subservience of the members of the Communications Commission to the radio monopolists.

For the reason herein given, I believe that a congressional investigation should be made of the radio monopoly and the Communications Commission in order that the House may enact the necessary legislation which will be helpful and not harmful.

INVESTIGATION OF UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 282 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

House Resolution 282

Resolved, That the Speaker of the House of Representatives be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint a special committee to be composed of seven members for the purpose of conducting an investigation of (1) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (2) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (3) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

That said special committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is hereby authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, by subpoena or otherwise, and to take such testimony as it deems necessary. Subpoenas shall be issued under the signature of the chairman and shall be served by any person designated by him. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses. Every person who, having been summoned as a witness by authority of said committee, or any subcommittee thereof, willfully makes default, or who, having appeared, refuses to answer any question pertinent to the investigation heretofore authorized, shall be held to the penalties provided by section 102 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (U. S. C., title 2, sec. 192).

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Speaker, this is a very important matter and there will be no opportunity for a discussion thereof except under the rule which provides only 1 hour's general debate.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time for debate on this resolution be extended 1 hour, which will make a total of 2 hours, the time to be equally divided between those for and against the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that the time for debate on the resolution be extended 1 hour, and that control of the time of general debate be equally divided between those favoring and those opposing the resolution. Is there objection?

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Speaker, I did not ask that control of the time be distributed, but that the time be divided equally. I am perfectly willing that gentlemen otherwise designated may control the time if the time is equally divided between those for and against.

The SPEAKER. The Chair may say that if the unanimous-consent request is granted, the Chair will recognize one gentleman to control an hour of the time in favor of the resolution and another gentleman to control the time in opposition. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] is recognized for 1 hour. May the Chair inquire if there is any member of the Committee on Rules who is opposed to the resolution?

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Mr. Speaker, I understand that the 1 hour, which will be in control of the gentleman from Texas, has been extended to 2 hours, so that he will be in position to yield half of the time to a Member on the minority side.

Mr. BOILEAU. No.

The SPEAKER. As the Chair remembers the unanimous-consent request of the gentleman from Wisconsin, it was that one-half of the time be controlled by a Member in favor of the resolution and the other half by someone opposed.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. I did not so understand.

The SPEAKER. And that unanimous-consent request was granted.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, the usual practice is to give control of one-half of the time to the minority side of the committee.

The SPEAKER. The Chair was endeavoring to ascertain if there is any member of the Committee on Rules on the minority side who is opposed to the resolution.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Michigan rise?

Mr. MICHENER. To submit a unanimous-consent request, Mr. Speaker. I am very much interested in the integrity of the rules and in the practice as we have always understood it here, and I believe that is what we all want to maintain. In view of that, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings just had with respect to the unanimous-consent request of the gentleman from Wisconsin be vacated, and that the time of the chairman of the Committee on Rules be extended to 2 hours, to be disposed of in the usual way, it being understood, of course, that those opposed to the resolution will have time.

Mr. BOILEAU. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that the Republican members of the Committee on Rules and other committees have always been very fair to those of us in the minority parties. I have no desire to disrupt the ordinary procedure. May we have the understanding, Mr. Speaker, that half of the 2 hours will be given to Members who wish to speak in opposition to the resolution? I do not care who controls the time. I am perfectly willing that an hour be under the control of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] and an hour under the control of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. TAYLOR], if they will advise the House that they will endeavor to give half the time, respectively, to Members opposed to the resolution.

Mr. MAVERICK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I see no reason to object to that request, because I am opposed to the resolution and the gentleman has already agreed to give me time. I believe that both the gentlemen in control of the time will be fair, although they are in favor of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Chair can only submit the parliamentary question now pending. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. BOILEAU. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Tennessee and the gentleman from Texas have an understanding about the time and will divide the time between those for and against the resolution, that is all the assurance I want.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. I shall be pleased to allow time to those opposed to the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan that the proceedings with reference to the unanimous-consent request of the gentleman from Wisconsin be vacated, and that the time be extended 1 hour and the gentleman from Texas have control of the 2 hours?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 hour to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KELLER. Will there be any opportunity to offer amendments, and if so, when and how?

The SPEAKER. That is a matter entirely within the control of the House. The Chair may state, however, that if the motion for the previous question on the resolution should be voted down, the resolution would be open to amendment.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution, as it shows on its face, is for the purpose of investigating un-American activities.

I desire to make it plain in the beginning of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, that this investigation is not directed at any race, and that the impression which has been created in some quarters that this investigation is directed at the German-American people is unfounded. I would not have anything to do with any investigation that sought to cast an aspersion upon the German-Americans of this country. I know of no more loyal citizens than the majority of German-Americans in this Nation. My own mother is of German descent. I desire to refute some of the unfounded charges that have been made to the effect that this investigation is aimed in that direction. This investigation is not directed at any race, for we all live in America, peoples of all races and of all creeds. While we may have our differences with regard to economic questions or methods that men use to achieve cer-

tain objectives, it seems to me that certainly all Americans of every political faith can agree upon those inherent and fundamental rights that distinguish this country from all foreign nations. I have often believed that the distinction between the American form of government and the forms of government which prevail in many European countries is the conception we have in America that we derive fundamental and inherent rights not from society, not from governments, but from Almighty God, and having derived those fundamental rights from God, no man or no majority of men can deprive us of the inherent right to worship God according to the dictates of our conscience or to speak our opinions and our convictions as we feel them. I can assure the House here and now that if I have anything to do with this investigation it will in no sense be an effort to abridge the undisputed right of every citizen in the United States to express his honest convictions and enjoy freedom of speech.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WARREN. The wording of this resolution is most unusual. I do not recall a similar case. This resolution seeks to set up an investigating committee, but nowhere in the resolution do you provide for a report to Congress. This means that the lid is off. It would mean that you could come back here next January and ask for permission to file a report or to extend the inquiry over a period of years, if you cared to do so. I believe 7 months is long enough to investigate any subject on earth. The gentleman controls the previous question, and I am wondering if he would accept an amendment for a new section providing that the committee shall file its report to the House on January 3, 1939, or may file its report earlier, in case the House is not in session, with the Speaker of the House for printing as a public document. I may say this has nothing to do with whether or not I support the resolution. All I am asking is, Will the gentleman permit the filing of the report?

Mr. DIES. I may say to the gentleman it was my understanding and belief that any committee created by this Congress would terminate at the expiration of the Congress. I see no objection to the amendment, as far as I am concerned.

Mr. WARREN. I hope the gentleman will accept the amendment. If not, we will just have to vote down the previous question so we can amend the resolution.

Mr. DIES. I see no objection to the acceptance of the amendment. It is perfectly all right with me, because I believe the committee ought to conclude its hearings by that date.

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I yield.

Mr. MAVERICK. We do not want to be barred from offering other amendments, and if the resolution is to be open for one amendment, it ought to be opened for all amendments; and if the gentleman agrees that it may be opened for one amendment, would the gentleman agree to open it for all other amendments?

Mr. DIES. That is not a matter for me to agree to. That is a matter for the action of the House.

Mr. O'CONNELL of Montana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNELL of Montana. I have an amendment with respect to the Jersey City situation which I think ought to go in the resolution. [Laughter.]

Mr. DIES. As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, when I was interrupted, I have absolutely no patience with any effort in this country to abridge the rights of speech. I opposed a movement in my country which spread from one section to the other, and which was aimed at religious freedom and directed at certain races, and any effort in this country to create prejudice toward certain people on account of the fact that they happen to belong to certain racial groups is unworthy of the fundamental ideals of Americanism, as I understand them.

Now, I know the argument will be used, What is the value of an investigation? I have a mass of information that has been supplied to me that is shocking, information which shows the extent of the Nazi and Communist movements in the United States. I am not one of those who are inclined to be alarmists. I am not inclined to look under every bed for a Communist, but I can say to this House that there is in my possession a mass of information showing the establishment and operation of some 32 Nazi camps in the United States, that all of these camps have been paid for, that they claim a total membership of 480,000, that they assemble in these camps, and I have seen photographs that have been furnished from various sources showing the fact that in these camps men are marching and saluting the swastika, if that is the proper word for it. Not only is this true, but I have information in my possession that certain individuals and groups in America have contributed funds for the purpose of encouraging the Fascist or Nazi movement in this country, and may I say in that connection that so far as I am concerned I regard communism and nazi-ism and fascism as having one underlying principle—dictatorship—the theory that government should have the right to control the lives, the fortunes, the happiness, the beliefs, and every detail of the life of the human being, and that man is a pawn of the government, rather than the American conception that government is created for the benefit of mankind.

Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota. If the gentleman says he has positive information that there are 31 bund camps now organized in the United States, why does he not, as a member of the Rules Committee, see that the bill (H. R. 10003), the Voorhis bill, to forbid private military companies and organizations is passed by the House, rather than go on a fishing expedition all over the country when you have the information now?

Mr. DIES. I will say to the gentleman that I never knew there was such a bill until this morning, when it was shown to me, I believe, by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAVERICK].

Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota. Will not the gentleman admit that when he knows the condition that exists in respect to Nazi activities in the United States, that the thing to do is not to waste 7 months on that committee, but to pass an act immediately?

Mr. DIES. That is easy to talk about, but the most difficult matter in the world is to deal with this subject. In the first place neither the gentleman, nor I, nor any Member of this Congress would sanction any legislation that might have as its effect the abridgment of the right of free speech in America. I care not what the gentleman's views are, I care not what his economic or religious or political views are, and I respect every man in this House who believes in his views, but I do believe that every man's right to express those views should be safeguarded.

Mr. HARLAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. Yes.

Mr. HARLAN. Is it not true also that there is a matter involved here that is a great deal more comprehensive than mere military drilling, in that it is to the interest of the people of the United States to find where these funds are coming from?

Mr. DIES. That is right.

Mr. HARLAN. And what other activities they are engaged in, and who is the leader, and the general program of undermining our institutions. They would not be covered by a merely military organization.

Mr. DIES. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas has used 10 minutes.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes more. In connection with some of the information that has come to my attention. I have seen affidavits signed by supposedly reputable people, charging that in one of the principal Nazi

camps only recently a speech was made by one member of this bund advocating the assassination of the President of the United States. In addition to that, on the other hand, I hold here a letter which was written to my colleague, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR]. I cannot read the name of the man who signed the letter, because I have been asked not to do that, but the charge is made in the letter that in the city of New York the Communists are preparing to picket the home of the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR]—and I do not deny the right of men to picket industries where there is a labor dispute—and to harass and humiliate and to use every effort and purpose to bring about the political destruction of this Member of Congress.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman made such a clear-cut statement, with which I agree, a moment ago with reference to communistic activities, that I ask him whether he heard Browder's radio address last night, beginning at 10:30 and ending at 10:40 on this subject, and I suggest if the gentleman did not hear it, that he move heaven and earth to get a copy of it, because it was a hair-raiser.

Mr. DIES. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. Yes.

Mr. KELLER. How many committees or commissions have already been appointed by this House for a similar purpose?

Mr. DIES. There was one committee appointed some years ago headed by our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] that performed a very useful function. Let me say to the gentleman that I believe all depends upon the way the committee is handled. I can conceive that a committee constituted or composed of men whose object it is to gain publicity, or whose object it is to arouse hatred against some race or creed, or to do things of that sort, might do more harm than good. On the other hand, investigations have a useful purpose. The other body creates committees constantly to investigate. I am not in a position to say whether we can legislate effectively in reference to this matter, but I do know that exposure in a democracy of subversive activities is the most effective weapon that we have in our possession. Always we must keep in mind that in any legislative attempt to prevent un-American activities, we might jeopardize fundamental rights far more important than the objective we seek, but when these activities are exposed, when the light of day is brought to bear upon them, we can trust public sentiment in this country to do the rest.

Mr. KELLER. Was there not another committee headed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH]?

Mr. DIES. I do not know about Mr. FISH's committee.

Mr. KELLER. And did they not get about all the publicity possible before this country?

Mr. DIES. I know the gentleman from Illinois is a liberal-minded gentleman, but let me say to the gentleman that some of these groups, especially the Communists, are very strong in their advocacy of freedom of speech in this country. In Russia, however, they have destroyed freedom of speech, and people throughout that great area are mere pawns in the hands of unscrupulous bureaucrats.

Mr. KELLER. What was the recommendation of the McCormack committee and what have we done about it?

Mr. DIES. Oh, I have only a few minutes, and the gentleman must not ask me to go into that.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN. If this resolution passes, naturally the gentleman, or whoever is made chairman, will be appealing for an appropriation. Can the gentleman give us any idea as to the cost of this investigation?

Mr. DIES. Let me say to the gentleman that so far as I am concerned, I am opposed to lavish expenditure of money on these investigations. I shall oppose any effort to create

an army of useless agents running around over the country, and I shall be opposed to any effort to pad any rolls, or to put any political friends on the pay roll, and so far as I am concerned, if the House votes this investigation I shall insist upon an economical investigation with sufficient funds to do the work.

As to the amount involved, I do not know; that is a matter that the Committee on Accounts will go into. I am sure it will be handled properly.

Mr. COCHRAN. As a member of the committee which will be required to vote this money—and, of course, the committee will consider it mandatory to vote the money if this resolution passes—I feel that the House should know now what sort of request is going to be made, how much money is going to be asked to carry out this resolution.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

As I said a moment ago, the gentleman's committee will consider the matter, and that committee has shown a disposition in the past to be very careful about appropriating large sums.

Mr. COCHRAN. There is no limitation whatsoever in the resolution pending. There is nothing in the world to prevent the gentleman from Texas or anyone else offering an amendment to a resolution appropriating a certain amount to double, triple, or even quadruple the amount recommended by the committee.

Mr. DIES. I assure my distinguished friend from Missouri that that will not be done.

Mr. COCHRAN. I think the House should have some information as to whether it will cost \$5,000, \$10,000, \$20,000, or \$25,000.

Mr. DIES. I do not know. What does the gentleman think about it?

Mr. COCHRAN. I do not think we should spend more than \$20,000 on the investigation. I would like an expression from the gentleman on that.

Mr. DIES. As I said, it is rather difficult for me to give an expression, because I do not know.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman will have an idea just the minute this resolution passes.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. I may say to the gentleman from Texas that while in his opening remarks he expressed deep sympathy to the patriotic German-Americans and that he is opposed to anything which would inflame Americans toward one particular race, I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that this country has been flooded with publicity regarding subversive activities. The gentleman's committee's investigation is going to be followed with a tremendous amount of publicity which I fear may inflame the American people against innocent but honest and good patriotic German-Americans. I caution the gentleman to use every effort in his power, if he is going to be chairman of this committee, to oppose anything that might be done in his committee to put publicity out into our country which will inflame one race against another.

Mr. DIES. I am in entire sympathy with the gentleman's statement. As I said a moment ago, there is no one who detests more sincerely or more deeply than I any attempt to inflame the American people against any group within our boundaries.

Mr. STEFAN. I hope the gentleman will carry that attitude throughout the investigation.

Mr. DIES. I hope I may now be permitted to proceed with my statement, which thus far has been rather disconnected. This resolution has been endorsed by the American Legion. I ask unanimous consent to incorporate the resolution of endorsement at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE,
Washington, D. C., May 25, 1938.

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN,
Chairman, Immigration and Naturalization Committee,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: There is now pending before the House Rules Committee House Resolution 282, introduced by Mr. DIES, of Texas; and speaking for the American Legion, I desire to urge a favorable report on this resolution. The purposes of this legislation have long been advocated by our organization. The New York convention, September 20-23, 1937, unanimously adopted the following resolution:

"Be it resolved by the American Legion in this its national convention in New York City (1937), That we reaffirm our opposition to communism, fascism, nazism, and all other forces and organizations that seek to destroy the free institutions of our constitutional system; and be it further

"Resolved, That we condemn, and will oppose, all alien organizations which in our country promote loyalty to some other government or system, and we request that Congress investigate and make public its findings on organizations in the United States which are militantly serving Germany, Italy, Russia, Spain, or any other alien power or system; and be it further

"Resolved, That we urge national legislation that will punish American citizens who advocate the overthrow of our Government by force, fraud, or violence, and deport all aliens who so advocate such overthrow."

Again, at the meeting of the national executive committee at Indianapolis, Ind., on May 5 and 6, 1938, in taking a militant stand against all un-American influences, they there reaffirmed the American Legion's opposition to communism, fascism, nazism, and all other forces and organizations that seek to weaken or destroy the free institutions of our constitutional system.

I shall appreciate very much if you will call this action to the attention of the Rules Committee.

Very truly yours,

JOHN THOMAS TAYLOR,
Director, National Legislative Committee.

Mr. DIES. It has been endorsed by the Veterans of Foreign Wars. I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the RECORD their endorsement.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Kansas City, Mo., May 24, 1938.

Re House Resolution 282.

The Honorable MARTIN DIES,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: We were happy to note that the Rules Committee made a report recently recommending the favorable consideration by the House of Representatives of House Resolution 282, to authorize the appointment of a special committee of seven House Members to conduct an investigation to determine the extent, character, objects, and sources of un-American propaganda activities in the United States designed to accomplish the overthrow of our representative form of constitutional government.

The purposes and sources of such activities ought to be exposed, in the full light of publicity, for the information of all loyal citizens, so that corrective steps may thereupon be devised.

We sincerely hope that the Members of the House of Representatives will, by formal vote, authorize a full investigation into these un-American activities, evidently inspired and financed by foreign sources.

Respectfully yours,

M. W. RICE,
Legislative Representative.

Mr. DIES. I also ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a list of a large number of patriotic organizations, including the German-American Union for Culture, endorsing this resolution.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

ORGANIZATIONS ENDORSING INVESTIGATION OF UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

American Legion.
American League for Peace and Democracy.
Allied Organizations of the Grand Army of the Republic.
Committee for Industrial Organization, Newark, N. J.
Democratic Central Committee, Indiana.
Daughters of America.
Deutsche-Amerikanischer Kultur Verband (German-American League for Culture).
Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union, Local No. 68, Pennsylvania.
Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.
Fraternal Patriotic Americans, Inc.

Disabled American Veterans of the World War.
General Executive Board, State Councils of Junior Order of United American Mechanics, Inc.
House of Representatives of the State of Indiana.
Heights Jewish Club, Inc., New York City.
International Workers Order.
International Typographical Union.
Jewish War Veterans of the United States.
Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic.
New York City Federation of Women's Clubs, Inc.
Non-Sectarian Anti-Nazi League.
Non-Partisan League, Massachusetts.
Senate of the General Assembly of the State of Indiana.
Toby Edison Memorial Club, Newark, N. J.
United Spanish War Veterans.
United War Veterans Council.
Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

Mr. LUCKEY of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I yield.

Mr. LUCKEY of Nebraska. Is this resolution broad enough to include investigation of foreign propaganda aimed at embroiling the United States in foreign wars, either in Europe or in Asia?

Mr. DIES. There have been a number of charges that a tremendous amount of foreign money is being spent in the United States for that purpose. I recently saw the statement in one of the newspapers that France has set aside in their budget a certain amount of money for propaganda in the United States. I am sure that the committee could legitimately go into the question as to the amount of funds sent for propaganda purposes in the United States. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I not only favor this rule but I am in enthusiastic accord with the resolution which it makes in order. I desire to commend and congratulate my colleague from Texas [Mr. DIES] on his introduction of this meritorious measure, because the time has come when we must not only investigate subversive influences and un-American activities now rampant in the United States but we must proceed to arrest and throttle them if our boasted democracy is to continue.

This resolution is not confined to any particular type or denomination of un-Americanism. It embraces all varieties—nazism, communism, and fascism—and none of these "isms" has any place on American soil. There is room in the American atmosphere for but one flag, and that flag is the red, white, and blue—Old Glory. There is place in the American dictionary for but one "ism," and that is old-fashioned, simon-pure Americanism. And any man or woman who would hoist any other flag than Old Glory or preach any other "ism" except Americanism is not only unworthy of American citizenship, they are not even entitled to temporary residence in this "land of the free and home of the brave."

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. How long ago has it been since we had a similar committee make such an investigation?

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Almost 5 years ago.

Mr. KNUTSON. How much did it cost?

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. About \$25,000.

Mr. KNUTSON. It is my recollection it cost \$100,000.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Oh, no.

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes. They came back several times.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is mistaken. It cost a little less than \$30,000.

Mr. KNUTSON. What did it accomplish?

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. It accomplished a great deal.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Minnesota is covering a very large field.

Mr. KNUTSON. Well, what did it accomplish?

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not want to take up the gentleman's time.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. It brought to the attention of the American public the damnable efforts that were being made in this country. It aroused public opinion. As a result, several pieces of legislation have been enacted into law. Several bills are now pending that passed the House and are in conference. I am sure a conference report will be presented within a few days. One requires propagandists in the employ of any foreign agency to register so that the American people will know who those paid propagandists are.

Mr. KNUTSON. Is it necessary to go through all that again?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am not going to take up any more time. I will discuss that in my own time, if I get any.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. The activity has increased very materially since that time.

Mr. Speaker, a few years ago I had the privilege and honor to serve on a special committee, headed by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], which investigated un-American activities in this country. While our committee was considerably handicapped on account of lack of funds and inadequate power to enforce its processes, I think the committee did an excellent job. As a result of our investigation and findings certain salutary legislation has resulted. We discovered in our probe that there are certain well-organized un-American movements operating in this country which were parented and financed by foreign governments, and which are inimical to the welfare of this Nation. We found an active communistic movement in our land, which recognized no other government than that enthroned in Moscow, and we found a very active Nazi movement which recognized no other authority save that of the German Fuehrer, Adolph Hitler. We also found a Fascist movement, which was more or less passive and desultory, which had its foundation in Rome and paid tribute alone to Mussolini.

I am sure that the investigation conducted by the McCormack committee had the direct effect to retard the growth and activities of these movements for a while, but as a result of an apparent lethargy of interest in patriotism generally prevalent throughout the land and a manifest disposition on the part of those in authority to either ignore or minimize the seriousness of this menace to the perpetuity of our Government these movements have taken on fresh courage and are becoming daily more arrogant and audacious.

When we investigated Nazi and other propaganda pursuant to House resolution 198, Seventy-third Congress, the Nazi organization in this country was known as "the friends of New Germany." While at that time their activities were a gross prostitution of the privileges which they were accorded in this country, nevertheless there were few signs of militarism in their maneuvers. But today, Mr. Speaker, under the new designation—German-American Bund—they have vastly increased their number, have acquired by purchase some 30 camp sites where they carry on military training schools attired in a foreign uniform and under a foreign flag. I understand that in these camps they assemble the youths on the holy Sabbath and teach them to goose-step and hail Hitler. I understand that as a feeble pretense they sometimes have an American flag inconspicuously displayed, but it is so deluged with drapery bearing the swastika insignia that our flag dwindles into comparative insignificance.

Mr. Speaker, we have no place in our scheme of government for dual citizenship. We must be either American or alien. There can be no qualification or reservation when it comes to allegiance to our flag and to our country. No man can maintain allegiance to the United States and at the same time bear allegiance to some foreign king, potentate, or dictator no more than he can serve both God and mammon. Such a performance is a sheer mockery "of the purest ray serene," and it is the purpose of this investigation to develop the facts to the end that the necessary legislation may be enacted to put a stop to this sort of skullduggery. [Applause.]

Think of it, Mr. Speaker, American soil, purchased undoubtedly with foreign money, dedicated and used as camps in which to assemble, and clad in a foreign uniform, under a foreign flag, and to the music of foreign military airs, hail a foreign ruler, and drill and parade in the honor, and at least constructively, in the service of a foreign government.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman briefly.

Mr. KNUTSON. Is not the Department of Justice aware of these activities?

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. I do not know. It may be they are, but I doubt if we have statutes which would cover this.

Mr. KNUTSON. Why not bring in legislation based on the information presented to the Rules Committee?

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. We expect to make a thorough investigation of this matter with that in view.

Mr. KNUTSON. Well, just assume all the gentleman says is true, why not bring in legislation putting a stop to it and giving the Department of Justice the authority to put a stop to this?

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Why does not the gentleman introduce such a bill?

Mr. KNUTSON. Because I am not aware of what the gentleman charges.

Mr. PATRICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. PATRICK. It seems to me the most important thing involved in this matter is what is an un-American and what is an American activity? Who is to pass on that question?

Some things have been mentioned that perhaps we would concede to be un-American. But what is un-Americanism?

I know those things to which the gentleman refers may be, but, as this will be put into legislation, what will determine when anything is un-American so that we can put a finger on it and say that is it?

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. The Congress will finally prescribe that.

Mr. KNUTSON. Goose-stepping, for instance.

Mr. HAINES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HAINES. In other words, as Theodore Roosevelt said, any man who says he is an American but something else also is not an American at all?

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. Speaker, it is nigh unto inconceivable that such a travesty could happen here in this proud, intelligent, and patriotic country. It is a menace to good citizenship. It is a national scandal and must be eradicated in the name of national decency, if nothing more.

Aside from the military aspects of the bund, it preaches intolerance, bigotry, and race and religious persecution. This conduct violates the sacred tenets upon which our Government was founded—race, color, and creed are made inviolable under the terms of the Bill of Rights, which is our ark of the covenant.

Mr. KELLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. KELLER. Was the gentleman not a member of one of the committees that worked on this matter?

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. I just stated that a moment ago.

Mr. KELLER. What recommendation did that committee make?

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. We made a number of recommendations.

Mr. KELLER. What has been done?

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Legislation has been passed and another bill is now pending in conference which resulted from the recommendations we made at that time. The report is on file in the document room, and if the gentleman will apply there he may get the report of the committee.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Is it not true the House and Senate have passed a bill which is now in conference dealing with some of the very things to which the gentleman refers?

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota. I think the purposes of this resolution are already known to every American. Is it not true that the March of Time about 3 months ago showed a 30-minute newsreel in this city depicting these camps? Is it not also true that there is pending before the House a bill which will accomplish what you gentlemen intend to accomplish a year from now?

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. If you will present the bill, I will support it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota. The bill is H. R. 10003, the Voorhis bill.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, in the Madison Square Roof Garden in New York City, 18,000 militant Communists assembled, denounced and advocated the overthrow of this Republic, and sang the Communist anthem, the Internationale, with red flags flying and Old Glory only conspicuous by absence. Communist radicals recently for the second time had the unmitigated audacity and depravity to desecrate that hallowed shrine sacred to every red-blooded American—Plymouth Rock—by enveloping it in red paint. The miserable wretches who committed this dastardly deed ought to be hunted down like rattlesnakes and kicked out of the country. [Applause.]

One thing is certain, Mr. Speaker, unless we arrest this insidious un-American influence, it is only a question of a short time until a revolution will ensue and the soil of our great country will be soaked in blood. Incendiary and un-American propaganda is being smuggled into this country by truckloads. Members of the American Legion and other patriotic organizations who are trying to suppress this deadly menace single-handed are being clubbed and sent to the hospital by these alien racketeers. It is up to Congress to do something. Why sit we here idle and supine, so to speak, when the very soul of this Republic is being violated and debauched. It is not only our responsibility, but it is our duty to ourselves, to our flag, and to our country to act now before it is too late.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that I would be derelict in my personal duty if in this connection I failed to pay deserved credit to one of our colleagues, the chairman of the Committee on Immigration, the distinguished gentleman from New York, Hon. SAM DICKSTEIN. SAM may be subject to an accusation of a degree of laxity so far as his immigration views may be concerned, because he has a big heart, brimful of milk of human kindness, and naturally many of these so-called hard-ship cases appeal to him, but so far as alien un-American activities are concerned, SAM DICKSTEIN has made a record for himself of which any patriotic American might be justly proud. He has fought these subversive influences in season and out, at considerable expense to himself, and often under threat of personal violence. He has treated these threats with courageous contempt, and he has disdained to dignify his traducers by even a slight show of recognition. In his gallant fight against the sabotage of our American institutions, he is entitled to your support today, and to show our appreciation of his valuable services, I trust this resolution will be adopted by a unanimous vote. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, a great deal of the difficulty which this resolution seeks to correct has grown out of a lax if not a deliberately negligent and unsympathetic administration of our immigration laws. When I first came to Washington, on March 4, 1919, we had practically no immigration policy.

Upon my own request, the Republican leadership placed me on the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, and I have remained on it ever since, being at present the ranking minority member. Due to my seniority and rank on the committee, under the procedure of the House, I will automatically become chairman of this important committee when the political complexion of the House changes, if I should be at that time in Congress. And I confidently predict that if that change in congressional complexion does not come in the election this fall, it is sure to come in 1940, and for good and sufficient reasons, too, which I shall not undertake to discuss here today.

As I stated before, we had no immigration policy prior to 1919. We were admitting aliens from every part of the globe except Asia, and America had become the dumping ground and melting pot for every character of mankind except Asiatics, and quite a few of them had managed to get in before the Exclusion Act was passed. We were admitting aliens by the hundreds of thousands without any regard whatever to their qualification for American citizenship. We were admitting the aged, the indigent, the halt, the lame, and the blind without any method whatever of selection or even inspection. We were admitting thousands of criminals, thousands of persons suffering from malignant, infectious, and contagious diseases, thousands of Communists, anarchists, and syndicalists.

One of the chief reasons which inspired my ambition to come to Congress was to help stop the indiscriminate flow of immigration to this country. Mr. Speaker, we have hundreds of thousands of good citizens in this country who were born abroad. I have several hundred of them in my district, and I am proud of them. I am proud of their loyalty to our country and its traditions. I am proud of the thrift they have displayed and the contribution they have made to my district and to my country. They came to America to better their condition and to help us build up this country, and to that end they consecrated their talents unstintingly. They availed themselves of the first opportunity to renounce foreign political ties and become naturalized American citizens. But, on the contrary, Mr. Speaker, we have millions of others who came over imbued with an entirely different spirit and different viewpoint. They care nothing about America or American institutions and traditions. They wanted to exploit America for their own selfish benefit and gratification. They never tried to become assimilated. They did not want to be absorbed; and that is one of our problems today. They have never become citizens, and hundreds of thousands of them are a burden to our society—inmates of jails, asylums, and other public institutions. They have jammed our relief rolls at the expense and to the exclusion of worthy native-born and naturalized citizens.

Shortly after I came to Washington, Mr. Speaker, the Immigration Committee reported out a bill to drastically restrict immigration, and it passed the Congress and became the law. I helped write the first restrictive immigration law ever placed on the statute books, and since then I have helped write many amendments, with the result that if the law were only enforced our immigration problem could be reduced to a minimum.

Pursuant to law, and under an Executive order issued by the President, during the last years of the Hoover administration more aliens were deported when added to the number who voluntarily departed than the total number admitted for the same period. For instance, in 1932 there were 19,426 deportations of aliens, whereas in 1934, under Mme. Perkins, Secretary of Labor, the number had dwindled to 8,879; and yet there are nearly a million—some estimates say more than 3,000,000—aliens in this country illegally, from whose ranks the Communist Party draws a considerable part of its following. There is in this country a large alien-minded element which wants to break down the quota barriers against restricted immigration and open the gates wide to the riff-raff of Europe; and I blush to say that the policies of Miss Frances Perkins have been far more friendly toward this alien

element than toward American citizenship, and particularly American labor. The case of the notorious Harry Bridges of the west coast is important because it is symptomatic.

While we Members of Congress who have been contending all the while for a greater rigidity in our restriction of immigration, we have been fortunate in having the support of all of the patriotic organizations of the Nation. Mr. Speaker, I desire to pay especial tribute to two of these organizations which have rendered conspicuous service in this respect. I refer to the American Legion and the Junior Order United American Mechanics. For the vigorous fight these two organizations have persistently waged against the admission of undesirable aliens, they have earned and certainly deserve the gratitude of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I am not a Legionnaire, but I am member of the Junior Order, and have been for almost a quarter of a century, and I prize my membership in this red-blooded organization very highly. In paying tribute to the splendid work performed by this organization, during my first term in Congress, on December 11, 1920, in a speech on the subject of immigration, I made the following statement:

There is an organization in the United States that has done more to arouse the Nation and quicken the public conscience to the dangers which lurk in unrestricted indiscriminate immigration than any other influence or agency in the whole country. The organization to which I refer is the Junior Order United American Mechanics. This splendid society is essentially an American institution. While it is comparatively in its infancy, having been organized in 1853, it has already almost achieved one of the chief objects for which it was organized—the restriction of immigration. The members of this patriotic order have assiduously gone about over the country industriously spreading the gospel of "America for Americans," and warning the people of the perils of unrestricted immigration, and have thereby created a sentiment of which the measure under consideration is a glorious culmination and crystallization. And for this patriotic, philanthropic service this great order and its membership are entitled to the gratitude of the Republic.

Mr. Speaker, I want to reassert the sentiment which I expressed almost 20 years ago, because I know it is fully justified by the record.

We must preserve America for Americans. For the descendants of the heroes of Concord, Valley Forge, and Kings Mountain to fold their arms in indolence and allow this great country to be wrecked and overthrown by influences imported from Russia would be the greatest tragedy that history has yet recorded. [Applause.]

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAVERICK].

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

INVESTIGATION—INVOLVES FUNDAMENTAL QUESTIONS

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, first I want everyone to know that I have no unfriendly feeling for the various gentlemen who have spoken in favor of this resolution. I concur with one of my friends in his praise of the flag—I concur with another one on his praise of constitutional liberties. But I disagree with methods and conclusions of these gentlemen.

And, gentlemen, this is an extremely serious question. We are now getting into fundamental questions of government, and some of those who seek to help certain groups in this country may be doing them an extreme injury.

In the first place, a measure like this with the same purposes was overwhelmingly voted down by this same Seventy-fifth Congress. It was the Dickstein resolution.

And this resolution is the Dickstein resolution and not the Dies resolution. All of the propaganda made in favor of it, before and since this resolution has been introduced, has been made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN].

Bear in mind this is to investigate Nazis, not Communists, all of the agitation, all the talk has been against the German-American bund, the so-called German-American Fascists or Nazis. Of course others will drag the red herring around and talk of Communists and the "red menace."

CERTAIN GROUPS WILL BE HURT AND NOT HELPED

Now, I wish to say something in line with my statement that many times people who think they are helping certain

groups often harm them. What I say is also a delicate question.

But I earnestly and sincerely believe that this character of legislation will engender race hatred, and will be, in the end, of considerable danger to the Jewish people of this country, and probably other minority groups.

I believe that this is the entering wedge of religious persecution.

We must be perfectly frank and agree that should racial hatred be engendered and should we unfortunately go the route of other countries, the Germans will get the best of it because there are more persons of German extraction here than there are Jews. I very much fear that this resolution will be the beginning of hard feeling between the German and Jewish elements in this country—both of which elements are, of course, as good Americans as any other groups of Americans.

As you know, the Jewish people are now being unjustly charged as being communistic as a race, and, of course, it is not true. But I obtain a great deal of correspondence which is indicative of a feeling which might be stirred up, because the American people are human beings like all others. What I fear is that if we begin an investigation like this, that it will be the beginning of various groups accusing each other of all kinds of unfortunate faults.

HUNGER IS THE BASIS OF VIOLENCE AMONG PEOPLES

Historically, hunger has always been the basis of religious or racial persecution, and violent action among peoples. In Greece, if someone expressed an unorthodox idea, he was called a Persian; when Rome got to have hard times, they accused a man of being a Greek if he did not agree with orthodox economic opinions.

In this country today, we have a tragic situation of millions of unemployed. Eight, ten, or twelve millions. If once the spark of intolerance and hatred is ignited, if people are hungry, if we who are in Congress haven't sense enough to settle true fundamental problems, it may be the match that sets off the persecutions that now exist in Europe.

Mr. Speaker, there is another thing—this investigation concerns, or might concern, international relations. It might cause international repercussions and do this country a great deal of harm. Such matters should be handled by the State Department.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAVERICK. Very briefly.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman intimate that the Americans of German blood in this country will become bigots?

Mr. MAVERICK. No; I do not believe they would be bigots. They are like all other people.

Mr. McCORMACK. I believe the gentleman ought to clarify his statement in the RECORD, because that would be a very unfair position in which to leave a great group of American citizens.

Mr. MAVERICK. The gentleman speaks about the great group of German people in this country. I have lots of Germans in my district, too, and I see no difference in them than in other good people.

When the matter came up before in the gentleman's other investigation, the gentleman's committee complimented the Germans because there were so many Germans, but gave the Russians hell.

That is the way it always is. It is human nature to damn anybody when he is not present. You can go to a Tammany meeting and cuss Republicans because there is none of them there.

Mr. McCORMACK. I challenge the gentleman to show that in the report anybody was damned by the special committee of which I was chairman.

Mr. MAVERICK. Well, my friend, it was the conclusions that were reached.

Anyhow, it was stated today the Nazis claim 480,000 members in this country—and that a member of the German Bund advocated the assassination of the President of the United States.

To this I can only say that from any viewpoint, this might be interpreted as a charge that approximately 500,000 members of the German bund—one half million—desire to overthrow this government, or that there are now one half million German-American traitors in this country.

It may be there are traitors in this country; but if there are, they are very few, and if anyone advocates or conspires to kill the President, we have laws governing this situation now. Moreover, if such an assassination had been attempted, it would have been known immediately to the Secret Service or the Department of Justice and it would have been attended to. If someone intends to assassinate the President, the thing to do is to act at once, and not to make speeches about it and investigate for the next seven months after the deed has been accomplished. Personally, I think it better to refrain from talking about assassination of the President—and if anyone has any remote information of that kind, to report it immediately to the proper authorities.

This is an example of what we may expect of this curious resolution, which is going to investigate everything "un-American." What the resolution is going to do is give blanket powers to investigate, humiliate, meddle with anything and everything in people's affairs in America, from the German Saengerfest to B'nai B'rith, and every other organization or individual in America.

A CONGRESSMAN'S HOUSE IS PICKETED—THEREFORE A NATIONAL INVESTIGATION

I want to show you this resolution is absolutely unnecessary. It is said that the Communists went out and picketed a Congressman's house. Do you mean to tell me a congressional investigation is going to stop picketing in a local place? Not under the American Constitution.

That is all hypocrisy, and you know it.

It was also said that "they"—nobody knows who—painted the Plymouth Rock red.

Do you suppose if an august body of Congressmen assembles it will keep people from painting Plymouth Rock red, white, blue, green, or any other color? The painting of rocks is a local matter, and everybody knows it; and certainly investigations are not going to stop such practices, whether done by Communists with malice aforethought or by college boys as a prank.

FOREIGN PROPAGANDA AGENCIES ALREADY REQUIRED TO REGISTER

Mr. Speaker, there is one further demonstration of the fact that this bill is unnecessary. There is a bill which was fathered in this House by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], H. R. 1591. It requires the registration of persons employed by agencies to disseminate propaganda in the United States. It goes into the details of what is meant by a foreign principal—and says that is the government of a foreign country, a foreign political party, or any foreign business, partnership, or association, or individual. It requires, as I have just indicated, a registration of all such persons engaged in foreign propaganda.

I have talked to Mr. McCORMACK, and he believes that this bill covers that particular situation. We cannot by an investigation—or by investigating for the rest of our natural lives, or by passing a law, prevent the "dissemination of propaganda"—or to put it into better language, the expression of ideas as originated in this country. We have freedom of speech, and we must protect it as long as we protect the Constitution.

Concerning the report on the bill, of which Mr. McCORMACK is the author, it says:

This required registration will publicize the nature of subversive or other similar activities of such foreign propagandists, so that the American people may know those who are engaged in this country by foreign agencies to spread doctrines alien to our democratic form of government or propaganda for the purpose of influencing American public opinion on a political question.

Now let me read further from the report. It says—

This bill does not in any way impair the right of freedom of speech, or of a free press, or other constitutional rights. On the other hand, this measure does provide that an alien coming to or in the United States for propaganda purposes of a political nature, and American citizens who accept foreign political propaganda

employment, shall register; and this was found necessary, in a number of cases, through the revelations of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Which brings out important points, that is, it will not violate constitutional rights, will protect us against foreign propaganda—and that a committee has already made the investigation and another one is not necessary.

And note the effectiveness of the legislation—

We believe that the spotlight of pitiless publicity will serve as a deterrent to the spread of pernicious propaganda. We feel that our people are entitled to know the sources of any such efforts, and the person or persons or agencies carrying on such work in the United States.

And already having such facilities, why waste the taxpayers' money on a fake side show?

My friends, this bill is already in conference, and will be enacted. So this matter is thoroughly covered.

If the matter is covered already by a previous and similar investigation, why go on investigating again? It is like getting an automobile, and then investigating it instead of riding in it.

The answer is that this investigation will merely stir up some trouble, and will do no good whatever.

WILL AN INVESTIGATION TAKE TITLE AWAY FROM NAZI CAMPS?

Now, they talk about the fact that the Nazis have camps. Suppose we have a congressional investigation, could we by that investigation divest some bund of the fee simple title to some camp? You know we could not do that. Not under our Constitution.

THE KU KLUX KLAN RAISED ENORMOUS SUMS AND OWNED PROPERTY

Do not forget that the Ku Klux Klan raised enormous sums and owned a great deal of property. They owned property in various parts of the United States. People got excited about it. As I remember it, I did so myself.

I fought the Ku Klux Klan, and considered it a troublesome and disturbing element. But what happened? They got bigger and bigger, but American public opinion, which can always be depended upon, wiped them off the face of the map.

I do not want to make any odious comparisons, because the Nazis are of foreign origin and have no place in our country. But as I have said, a considerable amount of legislation is already on the books in reference to this, we are about to pass the legislation indicated by Mr. McCORMACK, and we have enough information to pass any additional or necessary legislation.

And then people tell me that Nazis break up meetings. So do the police. So do Communists. The answer is that the various States can enact laws if necessary—that disorder is protected in every State, city, community in America, and can be stopped by the police. But no investigation we make will affect the situation.

Then they talk about the Communists. Of course, I do not know whether we are chasing Nazis or chasing Communists, but it is the same old stuff, and I will now try to explain some legislation. We have a report from the Department of Justice, and we have the bill that has been introduced by the gentleman from California [Mr. Voorhis].

WE PASS THE BUCK—INSTEAD, LET US ACT

Gentlemen, we have plenty of proposed legislation before this House right now that will cover this situation. Further, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] and his committee did a good job, or at least uncovered information and analyzed the principles of this question. Certainly then, no further investigation is necessary.

There is no use in kidding the public, much less ourselves, for we know enough now to pass the necessary legislation to cover the situation fully.

But what are we doing?

We are passing the buck.

We are coming in here and making pompous "patriotic" speeches, "Oh, how we love the flag! Oh, how we love America!" And then we are going to traipse out of Congress, doing nothing. The American people are going to laugh at us and say, "What did you do for us?"

"Oh, man," we can answer, "we fixed you up. We passed a resolution to investigate un-American activities."

SWEATING AND BELLOWING, THE KING'S ROYAL DRAGOONS

Yes, my friends, we can tell the people that we passed a resolution, and there will be lots of pictures in the papers. The "flash-bulb" boys and the photographers will rush back and forth, and there will be a lot of sweating and oratory about the flag.

But I ask you: This inquisition, this pompous going about the country, like the King's Royal Dragoons, swaggering about the country like inquisitors, is it going to increase dividends in business?

Is this dragoonade going to put any groceries in anybody's stomach? Will it educate a single child?

Is this investigation going to put 12,000,000 people to work?

What good, I ask you, is this resolution going to do? It is evasion, I tell you, evasion.

Oh, you say, we are going to investigate "un-American activities." Un-American! Un-American is simply something that somebody else does not agree to. If you are for the wage and hour bill, if you are for freedom of speech, if you are for a fair living wage—that apparently is un-American to some people.

Here, let me read you something else—I have in my hand a very finely written brochure, a part of which is as follows:

"Mr. Opposition: I am opposed to the wage and hour bill. It is un-American. It limits our freedom and liberty."

There is no telling what "un-American" means to some people. It is apparent that even the Supreme Court has held unconstitutional—and hence, un-American I suppose—the State and District wage and hour laws. By now, these same laws are held constitutional, and hence not against our form of government.

The Supreme Court has changed its opinions on dozens of legal principles and laws in the last 1 or 2 years.

Nobody knows what is un-American.

I ask you, What is un-American?

Mr. KNUTSON. The goose-step.

Mr. MAVERICK. Oh, principally it is un-American if you do not agree with somebody. That is what un-Americanism is, I suppose.

REPUBLICANS SAY ROOSEVELT IS UN-AMERICAN—WILL HE BE INVESTIGATED?

I do not know what this committee is going to investigate. All you can find out is that seven men, each according to his own judgment will investigate "un-American activities." Judge not, lest ye be judged.

The Republicans say that what Roosevelt does is un-American, and other people may say that some other thing is un-American. The Republicans on the committee can investigate Mr. Roosevelt and the Democrats can investigate Mr. Landon, Mr. Browder, Mr. Thomas—everybody who ran against Roosevelt. This will be the greatest fishing expedition that Congress ever undertook in the history of the United States.

WE HAVE SUFFICIENT INFORMATION NOW—A WASTE OF MONEY

Further, this is a waste of money; there is no question about it. There is no reason for this investigation, because we have right now all the information necessary.

We all know about the Nazi camps, where they are, and everything else. We all know that a Congressman's house has been picketed—not one but several.

LET THE PEOPLE EAT—HEADLINES INSTEAD OF GROCERIES

We do not have to investigate to find out what we already know; and if we do investigate, the only reason for our investigating will be for us to go around here and scare the people with exciting stories, making them suspicious of their fellow Americans, which will get the committee members headlines in the papers; in other words, the motto will be, "Feed the people headlines instead of groceries and jobs." [Applause.]

WHY NOT INVESTIGATE REAL FACTS—THE INEQUALITIES OF THE SOUTH?

Now, what could we do that might be of benefit to the country? We hear a great deal about the South. We hear a

great deal about the inequalities of the South, and I want to tell you serious inequalities actually exist.

If we really wanted to be somewhat or slightly statesman-like, if we really wanted to be students, if we really wanted to look into the economic welfare of this country, why doesn't this House that is getting so big-hearted and patriotic pass a resolution to investigate the inequalities of freight rates and the other inequalities affecting the people of the South so they will be enabled to comply with the requirements of the Minimum Wage Act? [Applause.]

This is something that is sincere.

This is something that is honest.

But this investigating "un-American activities" is simply fourflushing and ballyhooing around before the people of the United States, propagating more hysteria to sidetrack the real questions—and I want to tell you that the economic questions of this country will never be solved until you solve the problems of the South, and I am not a professional southerner or a baiter of southerners, either.

WHY NOT INVESTIGATE UNEMPLOYMENT?

There is another thing I want to bring to your attention. We had numerous requests for investigation of unemployment, but what did we do at the last session?

We sat together like a covey of scared quail and passed a resolution to have a 1-day census of the unemployed, and flew away to our districts. As a result, at this very moment we do not know the cause of unemployment, nor even have any idea about it.

We refused to investigate the question of unemployment.

Now, what's more important than that?

What is going to stop communism and fascism and all the violations of our Constitution except we go into these problems, these fundamental questions, instead of indulging in this superficial ballyhoo and bunk?

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to make this statement about the resolution: We have had these resolutions before, and, as far as I know, they did not do any good; but if they did do any good, they have procured all the information that is necessary, and we do not need any more resolutions like this.

I want to say this to the Democratic Party: We are charged with the responsibility of governing the people, and we ought to do it. And I want to say this to the Republicans: If you join in this, you are joining in ballyhoo and stupidity.

We have got problems to meet, and we do not meet problems properly in any such manner as this. This resolution is a slipshod written one, and if we leave this Congress in the shape we are in now, we will leave it on a sour note and we will leave it on a note of tom-tom beating, and we will not be accomplishing anything for the welfare of the American people.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAVERICK. I yield.

Mr. FLETCHER. I asked the gentleman to yield to make this inquiry: I believe the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] made a very extensive and detailed investigation of this matter at one time under the inspiration of various organizations. Was anything ever done as a result of his findings with respect to this subject, that the gentleman recalls?

Mr. MAVERICK. Well, we have had one Republican investigation that caused some furor, and that was the Fish investigation; and then we had the other one by Mr. McCormack and Mr. DICKSTEIN. I think we have had about a 50-50 proposition on these foolish things, and that ought to be enough.

I do say that out of the McCormack resolution the very thing that we are talking about is in conference right now, which I mentioned earlier in my speech. Gentlemen here voted for it, and that was to make it so that foreign organizations or agents have to register. That meets the situation, and what we are proposing to do now is to investigate the picketing of a Congressman's house and the painting of Plymouth Rock red. Nonsense!

Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAVERICK. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota. The gentleman said that the resolution is somewhat narrow. On the other hand it is general. On the first page there is the language:

All other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

Under that they could investigate Old Faithful geyser in Yellowstone National Park.

Mr. MAVERICK. Certainly. You have a resolution here that covers every question of fancy, fact, or imagination on the earth.

Mr. FLEGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAVERICK. Yes.

Mr. FLEGER. The gentleman said something about the unemployment situation. Is not unemployment the germ that creates racial hatred and prejudice that is brought about? Is not that what we are trying to remedy now, and does not that exist in the world today?

Mr. MAVERICK. That is true.

We should attack the unemployment situation.

That is what brought on nazi-ism in Germany. It was unemployment, distress. That is the reason that the Nazis got away with that stuff.

So we ought to attack the unemployment situation.

But I want to answer another argument that was made here. They say if you go to Germany or to Russia they will not let you criticize over there. No; we still have freedom of speech, press, and religion here, and that's the reason that the United States of America is a great country. [Applause.] It is because we let the Jew or the German or anybody else who lives here say what he pleases, even if he criticizes our form of government, our President, or our flag, because our form of government, our flag, and our country stand against all the onslaught of mere speech. Truth, in the end, decides. The essence of democracy is freedom of speech and religion and the security of government lies in each man having a right to live like a human being.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAVERICK. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. I think the gentleman is right when he intimates the purpose of this resolution is merely to provide a group of Congressmen with board and room during the summer months.

Mr. MAVERICK. I do not mind the board and room—what worries me is the trouble that will be caused.

Mr. FORD of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAVERICK. Of course.

Mr. FORD of California. Does the gentleman believe that people in camps heiling Hitler and saluting the swastika are engaging in activities that we ought to permit in the United States?

Mr. MAVERICK. No! But since you say it and it is common knowledge, why spend 7 months investigating what we already know? The answer to it is to be found in the Voorhis bill or similar legislation. Pass such legislation and you can stop uniformed bullies.

We have all the necessary information. But what we are doing here is merely evading the issue by a lot of loud talk, and I conclude by saying that I hope we will vote against this resolution.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAVERICK. I yield to my friend.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I have not had an opportunity to investigate the Voorhis resolution or bill. Does the gentleman from Texas recommend the Voorhis bill, and will he vote for it, if it comes up?

Mr. MAVERICK. I do not know that I shall vote for it letter for letter, but it has been referred to the Military Affairs Committee because it involves military uniforms, and, in effect, "private armies."

So let me repeat, we already know that the Nazis are walking around in uniforms, and I do not believe this country

should permit any private army. The Congress of the United States has a right to protect the Constitution and its laws, and we do not have to have an investigation in order to do that. In fact, it is our duty to do so, and when we have the information upon which to legislate, and we don't do it, we are not doing our duty, and are bamboozling the public.

We already know all we want to know about these Nazis, as well as Communists. This resolution is merely an excuse to do nothing.

Mr. STARNES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAVERICK. Sure.

Mr. STARNES. The House Immigration Committee has before it a bill, which it tabled, which would handle this very situation without the necessity of an investigation.

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, if we pass this resolution we are just passing the buck, and the American people will know it. It is a mania—it comes every now and then, about every 3 or 4 years. If we adopt this resolution it is adopting a scapegoat for the things we should have done.

We know very well that if we set our minds to it, we can pass the necessary legislation to cover all situations discussed today. We know very well that this resolution is to raise a big smoke screen, for us to go home without really meeting fundamental questions. Remember, my friends, headlines do not fill people's stomachs, nor loud speeches educate a child. [Applause.]

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the largest Nazi camp happens to be in my district. That is Camp Nordland, at Andover, N. J. If the last speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAVERICK], would go to that camp, he would change his mind about an investigation, just as I have changed my mind over the past year. There are things that take place there that we have no conception of, that we just cannot realize could happen in this country, and I shall tell the gentleman about it. In the first place, everyone who goes there is, first of all, a Nazi, and secondly, an American. They spend most of their time goose-stepping and singing Nazi airs and they display the swastika. It was not until after some of the old-time residents near there complained that they even showed the American flag.

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. I have only a few minutes. If I could have more time, I should be glad to yield. Most of their speeches have to do with preaching allegiance to Hitler. Nothing was ever said until complaints were made about preaching allegiance to the President of the United States. Young boys and girls are taken there and taught to pay respect not to the United States, not to the President of the United States, but only to Hitler and the Nazi Government. Consequently I think that one of the greatest dangers in a camp such as that is the fact that we are educating young boys and girls, our children, born in this country, to grow up, not to be Americans, but to be something else, to be Nazis, perhaps.

So, as I said before, I was originally opposed to this resolution. Since I have had it brought right home to me, however, I have come to the conclusion that we have got a job to do, and that the sooner we get to it the better off we shall be in this country.

I hope that this committee, when appointed, will not devote all of its time to nazi-ism. We have another problem in this country which is more acute and far-reaching than even the Nazi problem, and that is the issue of communism. The Communists outnumber the Nazis in this country at least 5 to 1. They are right in our own Government. They control certain W. P. A. projects, certain departments in the W. P. A. [Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. For these reasons an investigation such as this is, to my mind, the ideal and proper thing to do.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, let me point out one other thing we should investigate just as much as the two we have already mentioned; and that is the propaganda being disseminated by the agencies of our National Government. [Applause.] These in reality are just as un-American as the propaganda that is being spread by these so-called un-American groups. Furthermore, our present National Government is spending millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money just to perpetuate the bureaucrats in office. If you think they are not then I suggest that you urge the Rules Committee of this House to bring out House Resolution 433 to investigate the dissemination of propaganda by governmental agencies. Much of this is contrary to a Federal statute enacted on October 12, 1913, and therefore on legal grounds, as much as on any others, the matter should be investigated by our present Congress.

I hope you will pass the pending resolution and I hope also you will consider the resolution which I recently introduced. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BOILEAU].

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Speaker, the danger of writing a resolution as broad as this certainly is apparent after hearing the remarks of the distinguished gentleman, my friend from New Jersey. You fellows on the Democratic side are going to support this resolution. I do not know whether the gentleman from New Jersey is going to be a member of the committee or not, but if he is you will have from him an effort to investigate the New Deal, as he claims it to be un-American. [Applause.] He is not alone in that feeling. The fact of the matter is there are many Members of the House who, if they happened to be appointed to this committee, would take the same position he has expressed.

And then my good friend, the gentleman from Texas, showed here just the other day that he thinks that those of us who advocated the wage and hour bill are un-American, that that is an un-American activity. Knowing the gentleman from Texas to be a very high type of gentleman and a great American patriot, if he conscientiously and honestly believes that the wage and hour bill is un-American, and I think he gave us reason to believe the other day that he thought so, he will be fighting to see whether or not the A. F. of L., the C. I. O., and other organizations—yes, and whether or not some Member of Congress who advocated the wage and hour bill were not paying their obligation to some un-American organization.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOILEAU. I am very sorry, I cannot. And then there are many Members of this House who believe that the reorganization bill we had up here not long ago was un-American. We heard expressions on the floor of the House to that effect, and I know there are certain Members of the House, whom I do not see on the floor at the present moment, who believe that it is un-American. I suppose, therefore, that will be another jolt at the New Deal and the Democratic administration and they will want to investigate Members of Congress, the distinguished chairman, and other members of the Reorganization Committee on the ground that they were un-American in advocating that legislation.

My only purpose in bringing out these points is to bring to you, if I can, a realization of the danger that lurks in depriving American citizens of their rights of freedom of speech and freedom of assemblage, even though you might think there is some good objective to be gained. [Applause.] The greatest right we have, one of our cherished traditions, is the right of freedom of speech and freedom of assemblage. I say to you here and now that, so far as I am concerned, I care not what a man may say or in what group or with what clique he may gather, so long as he is an American citizen, so long as he is exercising his right as an American citizen to freedom of speech and freedom of assemblage I, for one, will take no action that will prevent his exercise of these rights. [Applause.]

If we pass this resolution, we will in effect be saying to American citizens, "Be careful! Be careful with whom you associate, and be careful where you go, because a handful of Members of Congress down there in Washington who take unto themselves the consciences of the American people, who try to control your conscience and mine, who try to say what you shall think and with whom you will associate, will hold you before the American people as enemies of our great democracy. They will call you unpatriotic, and it will take you the rest of your life to convince the American people that you are really patriotic."

Mr. Speaker, I want to make it very clear to my colleagues here today that I am not standing up here defending any man or woman who advocates the overthrow of the American Government by force or violence. If that is what you are trying to get at, then have the courage of your convictions and say in this resolution that you want to investigate the extent and character of propaganda designed to overthrow our form of government by force and violence. If that is what you mean, say it in the resolution.

It was stated on the floor here a few moments ago that ex-service men's organizations are supporting this resolution, and I do not deny the accuracy of that statement; but being an ex-service man myself, and having been thrown in association with many ex-service men, I am convinced in my own mind that those ex-service men who have expressed approval of this resolution meant in their own hearts, at least, to express approval of an investigation into activities and propaganda designed to overthrow our form of government by force and violence. They meant nothing beyond that.

Mr. Speaker, after the 2 hours' general debate is over and the previous question is voted on, I hope the membership of the House will vote down the previous question so that we may be given an opportunity to amend the resolution to take the un-Americanism out of this so-called American resolution, so we can say to the American people that so long as they exercise their rights in the American way, if you please, of freedom of speech and freedom of assemblage, in advocating such changes as they may see fit to advocate in our Government, so long as they advocate that being done under our Constitution in the constitutional way, and without advocating the overthrow of our Government by force and violence, their constitutional rights shall be protected, and they shall have the rights that were given to them in the Constitution of the United States and rights which, in my opinion, the gentleman from Texas, the gentleman from New York, or any other gentleman has no right to deprive them of.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOILEAU. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Would the gentleman vote for a bill making it a crime to knowingly and willfully advocate the overthrow of our Government by force and violence?

Mr. KELLER. That already is the law.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am talking to the gentleman from Wisconsin, and I do not need your observation. I asked the gentleman a simple question, Would he vote for such a law?

Mr. BOILEAU. I am going to answer the question. I may say if we can find words in the English language that will make it unlawful for a man to advocate the overthrow of our Government by force and violence without endangering the American citizens in their rights as American citizens, I would support the legislation. I say to the gentleman, however, it is a very difficult thing to give some Department of the Government the right to say whether that which you say or that which I say may constitute advocating the overthrow of our Government by force.

Mr. McCORMACK. I said "advocate knowingly and willfully."

Mr. BOILEAU. I understand the gentleman's language. When it comes to the question of knowingly and willfully, so long as you leave that up to human beings to define and to

determine whether it is knowingly or willfully, you are treading upon very dangerous territory. I agree with the sentiments expressed by the gentleman, and I agree with his objectives, but I shall be very careful in casting my vote upon any such proposition until I am assured that my vote may not deprive an American citizen of his right to free speech.

Mr. McCORMACK. Can my friend address to the House any stronger language than "knowingly and willfully"? Furthermore, will my friend bear in mind that in connection with any criminal statute some innocent person might be convicted of its violation, but they do have their constitutional right of trial by jury, the only thing that human ingenuity can give him?

Mr. BOILEAU. I submit to the gentleman I am in sympathy with his objective if it can be obtained without endangering the rights of American citizens, but as yet I have not seen language written in English—and I understand no other language—that in my judgment makes it absolutely sure it will not be abused, and I am willing to take the chance of having the benefit of the doubt cast in favor of the individual who seeks to express his religious, economic, or political beliefs.

I want to suggest an amendment which I shall offer in the event the membership of the House votes down the previous question. I have no misgivings about this. I know you are not going to vote down the previous question, because some of you are afraid you may be called Communists if you do, some of you are afraid you will be called un-American if you do; but if you do vote down the previous question and give me the opportunity to offer this amendment, I believe it will obtain the objective that most of you have deep down in your hearts. My amendment is as follows:

After the word "of", where it appears the second time, strike out the rest of the first page and insert in lieu thereof the following: "The extent and character of propaganda activities in the United States which have as their objective the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence."

Mr. PHILLIPS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOILEAU. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The discussion as I have heard it between the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from Wisconsin turns on the question of the overthrow of the United States Government by force and violence.

Mr. BOILEAU. I do not advocate that.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7½ minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE].

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, pending before the House of Representatives today is a resolution introduced by the genial and capable gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES]. Actuated as he is by the loftiest and most patriotic motives, nevertheless, there are those of us who like to denominate ourselves as more or less liberal who believe that this is a disguise for a smelling expedition aimed at liberal organizations in the United States. Particularly, the word "subversive" has been glibly used by certain speakers who have been the protagonists of this resolution on the floor of this House. The word "subversive" can be defined in numerous ways. It depends on the mental attitude with which one looks at the adjective. Does he view it objectively or does he view it subjectively? If he views it subjectively, is he not more likely to permit what Justice Stone, of the Supreme Court, says are economic predilections to characterize his understanding of the word "subversive." The speaker who preceded me has declared that the gentleman from Texas is conscientiously opposed to wage and hour legislation. If he viewed the word "subversive" subjectively and permitted his prejudices on the subject of wage and hour legislation to tincture his definition of "subversive" or "un-American," would he not develop a penchant to regard as un-American those of us who have championed the cause of wage and hour legislation?

I want to know who is going to define "un-American." What are its economic and political connotations? What

infallible instrument or high tribunal of justice will lay down a definition which will be accepted by the American people? "Un-American" is a relative term. What was American 75 years ago is un-American today and vice versa. This country was founded upon the recognition of the doctrine of free speech and its preservation against all hazards.

This Government was founded upon the philosophy of the French revolutionists, one of whom was the great novelist Voltaire. Voltaire said, in writing a letter to Helvetius:

I may not agree with a single word you say, but I will fight to the death to uphold your right to say it.

Let the gentlemen who espouse this remarkable resolution, this resolution aimed at undermining and sterilizing free speech in the United States, apply to this situation the very doctrine upon which the American Government was founded—

I may not agree with a single word you say, but I will fight to the death to uphold your right to say it.

Jefferson said this country should encompass "free men, free speech, and a free church."

Who is un-American now? Oh, I recall we had the Fish committee a few years ago, which was a witch-pursuing expedition designed to hold up to public obloquy and condemnation every liberal political organization in the United States. Then we had another, a Democratic committee, the McCormack committee. Are we going to repeat now? My God, the whole Nation is crying out for succor in its distress. It is pleading for legislative aid to extirpate financial distress from the Senate and the House, and you spend the solemn time of the House of Representatives, in the ninth year of the depression, in trying to investigate what you characterize as un-American activities. To what a low degree have we sunk in the legislative chambers of the Congress of the United States.

We know the Nazis in the United States are marching in uniform. Why, the F. B. I., under the leadership of Mr. Edgar Hoover, who wants more money for his organization, according to his statement, has photographs and complete data against these "anti-American," these "un-American" organizations, if you please. If we have the data, let us legislate, but why start a bogey-chasing expedition? Why establish a committee, the chairman and members of which can march into your State and into mine, sit around a table surrounded by newspaper reporters and motion-picture photographers, and receive endless publicity designed to mitigate or curtail all independent thinking? Communism! Why, it was suggested on the floor of this House that because the Plymouth Rock was desecrated the other day with red paint, ipso facto it must have been done by the Communists. We are told that a certain Member of this House, the chairman of one of our important committees, had his home picketed by what he termed Communists, so we are going to pass a resolution to investigate un-American activities.

Some of the men who came here touted as liberals, elected by the common people on the representation they were going to fight for the liberal cause, have now become tired and exhausted. These men came to Congress with a wealth of thought, and after a few terms in these perfumed halls they have ended by being dominated by the thought of wealth. I have witnessed several metamorphoses in my 18 months' service here.

The last sentence on the first page of the Dies resolution states that "All other questions in relation thereto shall be investigated by the committee." Where are we going to stop on this snooping, punitive expedition? Are we going to open up the whole field of political and economic endeavor in the United States? What are we doing to promote Americanism in the United States? "Americanism" is an abused word. It is as abused as the word "love" in the United States. Everybody talks about it, and nobody knows anything about it. It is like what our dear friend the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BINDERUP] found out. Everybody talks about money and banking and nobody besides himself, with a few exceptions, knows anything about it.

Americanism! I believe it is American to do certain things which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] would never believe it were American to do. I believe in Government operation of the Federal Reserve System. I have no doubt my friend the gentleman from Texas would say that was un-American and bordering upon communism.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Would the gentleman call American or un-American exercising the right of free speech and being paid by some foreign government for so doing?

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Being paid by some foreign government?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Yes. Suppose some foreign government pays an individual to get up and use his right of free speech. Is that American or un-American?

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Personally, I would not call that American; at least, it would be failing to exercise good judgment. However, my distrust of this legislation gravitates from my fear that it is aimed at progressive movements, parties, ideas. Inveighing at communism per se is a puerile pastime. Attempting to eliminate the social injustices which breed discontent is a laudable objective. Let us engage in that pursuit. Let us decline to temporize and refuse to embark upon running after will-o'-the-wisps when there are mountains of ice and apathy around us to melt.

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I yield.

Mr. MAVERICK. That is already covered by the bill, but does not the gentleman think this would put the Democratic Party in a silly position when it looks like we are going to be investigated ourselves?

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I recall that the Democratic Party was called communistic during the campaign of 1936. [Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Massachusetts 2½ minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, during the course of the remarks of some of the preceding speakers reference was made to the special committee, of which I had the honor to be chairman. They very kindly refrained from making any critical comment in my presence, although I sensed a desire to do so on the part of some. One of the speakers has talked about the Fish committee as a "red baiting" committee. I caution that distinguished gentleman that the use of names is a dangerous field to enter into and is also a sign of weakness. Mr. FISH is not a "red baiter." You know when one calls a man a "red baiter" he can call someone else a "red lover." I simply refer to this so that some of our friends who have a tendency to enter into the field of personalities may realize in the future that when they open the issue the other fellow has a chance to say something in return.

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Certainly.

Mr. MAVERICK. The gentleman made a statement somewhat to the effect that nobody criticized him personally, but he saw an intention on the part of some to do so. Does not the gentleman think that when we do not say anything about him that it is a little mean in a way for him to say we have bad intentions? [Laughter.] I may say to the gentleman that I did not have any such intention.

Mr. McCORMACK. I could not conceive of the distinguished gentleman from Texas having anything but good intentions; and if anything I said intimates anything to the contrary with reference to other gentlemen, I simply want to say that some of them conveyed that message in a subtle manner. For example, my friend who has just spoken called the gentleman from New York and his committee a "red baiting" committee, and then he referred to the McCormack committee, and he said nothing about that committee being a "red baiting" committee, but the remark followed up his

rather unkind and unnecessary and gratuitous and improper reference to the special committee of which the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] had been chairman.

Now, the committee of which I was chairman made an investigation by reason of a resolution which contained the same language that is contained in the pending resolution. Certainly no one accuses that special committee of doing anything that was not right. We received thousands of editorial compliments, and never one editorial comment of an adverse nature was addressed against the special committee of which I had the honor to be chairman.

What is un-American in the political field is entirely different from what is un-American so far as the basic fundamentals of our country are concerned.

I dislike hearing one Member accuse another of supporting un-American legislation when it is proposed and pending in this House, and I do not believe that gentlemen who advance the argument against this resolution that because somebody supported the wage and hour bill—and I supported it—that is un-American.

When anyone advances the argument that such legislation is un-American they do not mean that it is un-American so far as the fundamentals of our Government are concerned. I heard references made to the reorganization bill being un-American, but I never misinterpreted the state of mind of those who expressed such opinions. They were confining themselves strictly to the political field. Certainly, they were not impugning the motives of those who supported such legislation—and I did—so far as the fundamentals of our Government are concerned, and the great purposes for which our Government stands.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman, briefly.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Can the gentleman assure us that if this committee is created we will have a membership of gentlemen who would be able to distinguish, like the gentleman does, between what is un-American or otherwise?

Mr. McCORMACK. My friend flatters me, and I am sufficiently human to express my appreciation, but, of course, I cannot answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. BOILEAU. Does the gentleman agree with me that about the only thing that is un-American is the advocacy of the overthrow of our form of government by force and violence?

Mr. McCORMACK. I think the gentleman made a very fine contribution to this debate, but there is just one further field I might suggest to my friend.

If the previous question is voted down, there should be included the activities of foreign agencies in the United States seeking to mold public opinion or to form group action, not for the purpose of the overthrow of the Government but for the purpose of influencing the domestic or the external policies of our Government. Such activities are equally subversive of our institutions, and if the previous question is voted down, I suggest to the gentleman that he incorporate some such language in his amendment.

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. MAVERICK. Is not that covered by the bill H. R. 1591?

Mr. McCORMACK. I was coming to that.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BOILEAU. I believe we can all agree upon the particular point the gentleman brings out without having an investigation; and when it comes to the question of investigating, that should be confined to the extent and character of the propaganda designed to overthrow our Government by force and violence.

Mr. McCORMACK. Or whatever activities are being engaged in in the United States, which emanate from abroad, the objective of which is to create group action or to in-

fluence American public opinion in a manner so that our domestic and external activities will be affected. In other words, for instance, the activities in this country prior to our entrance into the World War, when foreign nations spent money and tried to influence public opinion on each side of that conflict. They sent their paid propagandists into the United States, and in my opinion that is wrong and a proper subject of inquiry. That is one of the things that I have in mind.

Mr. BOILEAU. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] and myself have advocated narrowing down this resolution.

Mr. McCORMACK. And the gentleman from Massachusetts, when his special committee was in existence, narrowed it down to these fields, and I am sure that my friend from Wisconsin will agree to that.

Mr. BOILEAU. Although I might not be in entire accord with the gentleman's objective, I say now that if he will join us who believe it should be narrowed down and vote down the previous question, I think there are enough of us here to amend the resolution in accordance with the views expressed by the gentleman from Massachusetts and myself, and I think we would be doing a great service to the American people if we could do that.

Mr. McCORMACK. And then would the gentleman vote for the resolution?

Mr. BOILEAU. If only those two propositions are in it; yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is fair. The gentleman's position is fair.

Mr. BOILEAU. Will the gentleman cooperate to the extent of voting down the previous question?

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course I have no control over that.

Mr. BOILEAU. The gentleman can vote against the previous question, and he is a very influential Member of this House, and can influence others to do that.

Mr. McCORMACK. Personally, I think the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] in having expressed a willingness to accept the amendment the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WARREN] proposed should also be willing to accept the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin, with the additional suggestions that I have made, making it broad enough so that an investigation can be made not only of those movements which are dedicated to the ultimate overthrow of government by force and violence, but as to any other activities, the objective of which is to form American public opinion on a political matter, or group action in arraying Americans against Americans, so as to ultimately affect the domestic and external policies of our country.

Mr. BOILEAU. The gentleman means only when they originate in foreign countries.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course.

Mr. BOILEAU. The gentleman's suggestion is not in entire accord with my views, but it comes close enough so that as far as I am concerned I shall vote for his amendment together with the one I have suggested, if we can vote down the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 minutes more.

Mr. McCORMACK. Might I suggest to my friend from Wisconsin that when the last special committee was created, in its operation under my chairmanship, the committee confined itself to those fields of investigation.

Mr. SIROVICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. SIROVICH. The gentleman has made a constructive suggestion. Does he realize that if we wanted to do through a congressional committee what he suggests that it would necessitate an investigation of the ambassadors and foreign ministers and others in this country, and we could not do that?

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, the gentleman knows that under no conditions could we summons or directly investigate an

accredited representative of a foreign government. Evidence that might lead into that is an entirely different proposition, if we obtain the evidence independent of the accredited representative or those associated with him. It is perfectly germane. For example, take the charges that are made about the Spanish Ambassador. Whether they are true or not, I do not know. I do know that someone called my attention to a lot of pamphlets that were sent through the mails from the Spanish Embassy, using the franking privilege. If I sent them through the mail it would cost me \$1.89, but that is sent under the diplomatic privilege. I do not know how extensively that is going on, but that was called to my attention, where it came out of the Embassy of the Spanish Government. Someone made a request for certain information, and they sent them all that stuff, and it would have cost \$1.89, I am informed, to send it first-class mail. How extensively that is going on I do not know. If there is a violation of franking privilege, the American people are entitled to know it.

Mr. KRAMER. The gentleman will recall that in the investigation of which the gentleman was chairman, information was brought out that the Silver Shirts were cooperating with the Nazis, and where they had German propaganda going on, and when they carried that out, they would join the things up and make an attack on some part of the Government with the purpose of overthrowing it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Brushing aside everything, we know what un-American means in the sense of this resolution. It does not relate, as feared by some, to the C. I. O. or the A. F. of L., or to this or that bill. Everyone knows what un-American means in the sense that it is used in the pending resolution, and this committee, whoever is in charge, would have the responsibility of confining its investigation to facts that we feel are of a subversive nature.

As a result of our investigation we made several recommendations, four pieces of legislation and two others that did not require legislation.

One or two of them have become law, another bill is pending in conference between the two branches. In my opinion that is one of the most important features of legislation the Congress could pass to meet any effort emanating from abroad operating in the United States through paid agencies, whether alien or resident, to formulate American public opinion on any question, whether it be nazi-ism, communism, fascism, war, or any other political subject. That bill passed the House unanimously. My friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin, supported it and my friend from Texas supported it. I took it up specially and called it to their attention. The bill passed the Senate unanimously and is now in conference on two minor amendments. The conferees, I understand, have or will soon agree. This bill was recommended by the special committee of which I was chairman. This bill would go a long way toward meeting the situation.

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. MAVERICK. Is it not a fact that insofar as it covers foreign propaganda emanating from a foreign source that if it is enforced it is an adequate piece of legislation?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; as adequate as human beings and legislators can accomplish under our scheme of government having in mind freedom of speech and freedom of the press. The pending resolution of investigation should pass. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUNN].

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, the resolution which is being considered before the House today is for the purpose of appointing a committee to investigate the un-American activities that are supposed to be going on throughout our country.

According to statistics there are, at the present time, approximately twelve to thirteen million people unemployed in the United States, which means that a big percentage of the

population is suffering because of the lack of food, shelter, clothing, and other essentials. In my opinion, this inhuman treatment of our fellow men is abominable, outrageous, and very much un-American. The committee should be authorized to investigate the cause of this unemployment condition.

President Roosevelt and some of the Members of Congress have tried to remedy the unemployment situation. If all the Members of Congress would think as much of their fellow men as they do of themselves there would not be any unemployment in the United States; all those who would be able to work would have a job at a saving wage; the aged and others who, because of a physical disability, cannot be employed would be given adequate pensions; sweatshops, child labor, slum district, and pophouses would not exist.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'MALLEY].

Mr. O'MALLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am overwhelmed with the generosity accorded those in disagreement with this resolution in the matter of time; they cannot get any. I fear the committee will be as arbitrary as the conduct displayed today. It seems to me that we are all tired out toward the end of this session. Apparently the open season on damn foolishness has begun, and we ought to adjourn before we lend ourselves to much more of this type of political ballyhoo.

Whenever a parliamentary body in any country of the world has found itself unable to deal with the economic problems that face the people dependent upon it, they go on a witch hunt. Here we are coming toward the end of the Seventy-fifth Congress faced with 12,000,000 unemployed, faced with a recession that is growing steadily, so we are going to offer the only solution we can think of, an investigation to try to determine what is un-American. Certainly a brilliant wind-up that should make our workless and hungry citizens very pleased and happy over their representation. If anything endangers our Government it is stuff like this in the closing days of Congress.

I have never been worried about anybody picketing my house. I do not think any Member of Congress should worry about that. If most of these terrible radicals you are so worried about were offered some doughnuts and coffee they will probably stop picketing your house and sit down on the porch. Radicals do not make conditions, but conditions make radicals. The place to start is to eliminate the things that create these poor, deluded followers of other theories of government.

This resolution can do no good. The Department of Justice is entirely competent to deal with every violation of law that we know exists. The Department of Justice has said time after time that the reason it could not deal with some of these camps and some of these people wearing uniforms is that they have no law under which to arrest and prosecute them. Why do we need an investigation? Why does not the committee bring out a bill making these things illegal? Then the Department of Justice, for which we appropriate millions of dollars every year, could enforce that law. The people of my section do not need any congressional committee to tell them what is good Americanism. And when any organization attacks our Government or advocates its destruction, our people back home will take care of them quicker and more effectively than any committee of Congress can. The thousands of dollars this investigation will cost is a waste of money. This is political faking for election purposes. Bring in a bill making illegal the things you complain about and let the departments enforce it, instead of authorizing another junket.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, this resolution has progressed to such a point that it would be unwise for this House to fail to approve it, because we sent word to the country—some newspapers, always critical, will make it appear, if the resolution is defeated, that the House of Representatives has declined to investigate un-American activities. That is the situation as I see it. I do not want to be accused of refusing to vote for legislation to investigate un-American activities. It is for this reason, having confidence that the

Speaker will appoint a committee that will be fair, that I am going to support this resolution.

Now, I want to again ask the gentleman from Texas, as it will be my duty in part to bring in a resolution to provide the expenses for this special committee, kindly to give the House some idea, before the resolution becomes effective, as to how much money he thinks it is going to take to carry on this investigation.

Mr. DIES. I wish I could answer the gentleman's question, but it seems to me that first we must create the committee. I may not even be a member of the committee.

I cannot make any statement as to what the committee is going to do.

Mr. COCHRAN. If the resolution passes today, as it will, the gentleman knows as well as I do that there will be a resolution dropped into the hopper without delay calling for an appropriation. You are delivering a mandate to the Committee on Accounts when you pass this resolution to appropriate money to carry out the purposes of the resolution. The gentleman should advise the Members of the House whether he expects \$5,000, \$10,000, or \$15,000.

Mr. DIES. As I understand, if the resolution passes and the committee is appointed, then we have to go to the Committee on Accounts to get the necessary funds.

Mr. COCHRAN. That is right.

Mr. DIES. That is for the gentleman and the other members of the Committee on Accounts to determine.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman abide by the decision of the Committee on Accounts if he is chairman of the committee?

Mr. DIES. I will have to.

Mr. COCHRAN. No. A majority of the Members of the House can overrule the Committee on Accounts. Will the gentleman support the amount recommended by the Committee on Accounts?

Mr. DIES. The gentleman might make it so low I could not.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman wants us to vote for a resolution, but still declines to name what he feels is a reasonable amount for expenses. I am going to support the resolution for the reasons stated, but I certainly hope the gentleman from Texas will not be unreasonable in his demands when he appears before the Committee on Accounts.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee and Mr. KNUTSON asked and were given permission to revise and extend their own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, this resolution is pending before the House today, I am safe in saying, because of the persistency and the activities of one Member of the House. Of course, the resolution which that Member introduced and any other companion bills which he may have introduced to correct a situation of which he complains are not reported by the Committee on Rules. However, the present resolution offered by the gentleman from Texas is the result of the activities and the persistency of the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN].

For the most part, I have felt that he was unnecessarily alarmed in regard to un-American activities and propaganda, because I could never bring myself to believe that any considerable portion of the American public would for a moment lend an attentive ear to any un-American propaganda. I believe that the American people have too much common sense, too much sound judgment, and too much reverence for their institutions and fondness for the privileges which they enjoy in our American form of government to listen for an instant to any blandishments offered by propagandists favoring a totalitarian state. Nevertheless, it appears to me that there have been so many charges made which many of the people of our country seriously believe to be true and there has been so much dust raised that the question should be settled once and for all. For this reason, I have come to the conclusion that the Congress should pass a resolution providing for an investigation.

There is one thing about an investigating committee of this sort, and that is it very often results in advertising the tenets and beliefs of those very persons whom it is the desire of the investigating committee to suppress. It often has the tendency to make those few who may be dissatisfied with conditions in this country learn these beliefs and tenets and lean toward that propaganda which we all deplore. However that may be, as was said by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN], I also have enough faith and confidence in our Speaker that he will appoint as members of this investigating committee men of a character and caliber who will hold this investigation within proper bounds; members who will not use the broad power granted by the resolution for any other purpose than to ascertain the truth or the falsity of the charges which have been made concerning the activities and propaganda against the principles of our form of government and our beliefs in the fundamental righteousness of the democratic form of government. I ask the membership to vote favorably on the passage of this resolution, believing, as I do, that any committee appointed by the Speaker will be fair, just, and impartial both in its investigation and its findings.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD of California. Mr. Speaker, I do not very often find myself in the position of supporting a measure of this type that has for its purpose an investigation of so-called un-American activities. A great many have seemed to be in doubt as to what un-American means. I want to make just one statement in this connection. As it appears in this resolution, it seems to me to mean, among other things, nazi-ism. That is un-American, and I deplore its existence in this country. The establishment of camps organized by a foreign power, and financed by a foreign power, which teach the young people of this country the philosophy of nazi-ism, which is "actual" the philosophy that would deny the very thing that some of you men advocate in the way of freedom of speech and assembly.

In my experience I have noticed that most of the people who advocate this free-speech stuff are the people who want to exercise freedom of speech in a way that is derogatory to good, sound, American principles. Of late that has become rather general. Those same people, on the other hand, are advocating communism, nazi-ism, fascism, and other isms. The very freedom of speech and assembly which they advocate would cause them to be suppressed in one split second in any of the ism countries.

Mr. Speaker, I do not care what these other nations have in the way of a government. That is their business. But I do not want them to try to attempt to inaugurate it in our country [applause] and I am not going to have it. They can have any kind of philosophy to animate their governmental principles which they desire; that is their business; but I do not want them coming over here to the United States, organizing camps, "heiling" Hitler, wearing a foreign uniform, and saluting a foreign flag under the American flag. [Applause.]

As a man dedicated to freedom of speech, of ideas, of religion, and of the press, I want to reiterate that I am naturally disinclined to advocate investigations into what is called un-American activities. Before supporting any such investigation I must be sure that it is not an attack on our liberty of free speech or upon any other of our cherished liberties.

That is a fine and tolerant philosophy with which I agree. But do not forget this salient fact: Many of the people who advocate free speech for themselves and free expression of their ideas are advocating a system of government that is now suppressing and will continue to suppress all free speech, free press, and the right to free religion.

This investigation seems to be motivated by right principles, seems to be based on evidence of what may prove to be a definite plot against our country, our system, our way of life. From all accounts democracy itself is the issue.

Any effort to destroy the American system, to replace our free representative government, our democracy, with some system transplanted from the Old World, must be stopped. Plainly, fascism is threatening our lives. Whether it is called fascism, nazi-ism, or by any other name, this is something that is hateful to all true Americans. And it is something that must be stopped in this Nation.

For it runs counter to every American principle. It abhors free speech, free religion, the free press. It abhors democracy, representative government, the right of the people to decide through their freely elected representatives the policies and the laws of the country. It discriminates among races, abusing and hounding to their very death innocent people because of their race or color or religion. This must be stopped, must not be permitted to get a foothold in the United States. It is subversive, destructive, anti-American.

The sure way, the American way, the President's way of preventing the spread of un-American doctrine, is for the Government to continue to place the welfare of the people before every other consideration. Widen opportunity for all the people, provide employment, make it possible for all who need work to get jobs, and the foreign seed with its poison will not grow in America.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, last year this Congress appropriated \$1,000,000,000 as a defense fund against possible enemies from without, imaginary enemies from without, some people believe. This Congress appropriated \$1,000,000,000 again this year as a defense fund against possible enemies from without. We have also authorized the appropriation of an extra \$1,000,000,000 for the expansion of the Navy, supposedly as a defense against possible enemies from without. We do know that enemies within are much more dangerous than enemies without, and it is enemies within at whom this resolution is aimed.

There is not a Member of Congress who does not realize that the world is in a critical condition. The staff writer of the Christian Science Monitor has this to say about present world conditions:

Democracy throughout the world is under unprecedented external and internal attack as communism and fascism aggressively assert the superiority of their unproved systems. It is timely, therefore, that the democracies reexamine their own doctrines and their own records. A rededication to and a reinvigoration of the spiritual, moral, and political concepts of democracy should be the purpose of this reexamination. It is similarly imperative that the defects in representative democracy be detected and corrected.

By representative government is meant government with the ultimate control resting with the people, with all the political liberties of criticism and opposition scrupulously maintained, and with impartial justice open to all who seek redress from wrongs.

By dictatorship is meant a government arbitrarily imposed from the top, with political freedom abolished and the individual subordinated to the state.

This is the condition that exists in the world today.

We have been told this probe may turn into a fishing expedition, and we have been told it may be a publicity stunt. That is possible; but what is absolutely needed, and what the purpose of this resolution should be, is to probe into the cancerous growth on the body politic, those open sores that have become aggravated in the last few years. It seems to me that whoever may be appointed on this committee has the responsibility and should see to it that this probe is directed at the things that are troubling our American society today—nazi-ism, communism, and other un-American isms.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, we have under consideration House Resolution 282. This resolution provides that the Speaker of the House of Representatives appoint a special committee to be composed of seven members for the purpose of conducting an investigation of (1) the extent,

character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States; (2) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, I favor the adoption of this resolution. It seems to me it should be adopted by this House without a dissenting vote in view of the startling information that has come to the committees of the House and the statements made by various Members here in our presence today.

No great nation was ever destroyed from outside attacks. Great nations have fallen almost without exception because of attacks from within. There are several large groups in this country who have been for some time, and are now, making attacks from within. I refer to Communists, Fascists, and Nazi groups.

There has been established on American soil what is known as the Nazi or German bund in many communities and in several of the States. This Nazi group forms themselves into camps. They wear the Nazi uniform, have the Nazi flag, they meet with great frequency, and the youth of this country and the men who belong to these camps in marching use the German goose step, carry the swastika or German flag, and they give the Nazi salute required by Hitler. They pledge themselves to Hitler and the Nazi cause, and we are advised that only occasionally is the American flag displayed, and when it is, it is in some inconspicuous place. These camps are made up of Germans and their sons. Many of them are alien Germans. Many are not American citizens. It is said there are approximately 500,000 members of these camps.

The question arises, Who is instigating and financing the training of German men and boys on American soil and pledging them to Hitler and requiring them to give the Hitler salute? We learn from the press that such groups have been formed in various South American countries of German men and their sons. Such groups were formed in Austria—in fact, they had a regular Nazi Party in Austria—and with Hitler they recently succeeded in overthrowing the Austrian Government and placing it under the heel of Hitler and his Nazi Party. The world has been brought to the brink of another World War over the formation of the Nazi Party in Czechoslovakia. Through intrigue and other means, Hitler has succeeded in uniting something like 3,500,000 Germans in Czechoslovakia against that Government. They goose-step, carry the swastika—German flag—give the Hitler salute, and pledge themselves to Hitler. The purpose of Hitler and his Nazis in Czechoslovakia was to overrun and take that country.

This same army of Nazis is being built up in this country. In the event of war between this country and Germany there is little doubt but what we would have to fight this group of Nazis in America.

There is another more numerous group being built up in almost every section of the United States—the Communists. They pay homage to Stalin. They give their allegiance to the Communist Party. The Communists in this country admit freely that the Communist Party is world-wide and its capital is Moscow in Russia. These Communists are busy undermining our Government, our institutions, our churches, and our schools. They, like these Nazis, are busy putting out subversive propaganda. They seek not only the overthrow of this Government but of every other government. Their desire is to bring all the people of the world under the rule and control of the Communist Party at Moscow in Russia.

Now, the purpose of this resolution is for a committee of this House to make a thorough investigation not only of communism and nazi-ism but of the Fascists and every other organization in this Nation that is putting out this un-American propaganda and engaging in un-American activities in the United States and diffusing within our country subversive and un-American propaganda. Let us find out what un-American and subversive activities are being carried on and who it is that is instigating these activities and providing the money to carry them on.

We have no Communists or Nazis in my congressional district. Our people are intensely patriotic and American.

There is no place in my district for the red flag of communism, swastika, or any other flag except the Stars and Stripes. We still believe in the old-time religion, our Constitution, and our institutions. Hitler, Stalin, and Mussolini have no appeal for the citizens of my district. We are opposed to the youth of our land marching under any flag except the Red, White, and Blue. We oppose their pledging their allegiance to any government except our own.

CONDEMNED BY COMMUNISTS

A group of Communists met in Louisville recently and passed resolutions, according to press reports, condemning my record in Congress and calling upon the people of my congressional district to defeat me for reelection.

I am not surprised that my record in Congress is unsatisfactory to the Communists. I am not for them. I strongly oppose their policies, their attitude toward our Government and our institutions and their hatred of religion and religious freedom. In this particular instance I rejoice in the enemies that I have made. I consider it an honor for any Member of the United States Congress to be denounced by the Communists.

FAVOR FREEDOM OF SPEECH, PRESS, RELIGION, AND ASSEMBLY

Every day we are warned that we must not take action against these Communists, Nazi-ists, and other un-American and subversive groups, as this country guarantees freedom of speech, of the press, of assembly, and of religion. I favor, and all those supporting this resolution favor, freedom of speech, press, assembly, and conscience as provided in our Constitution. These should not be used, however, by foreign governments and alien groups to destroy this Government. Let those who have the right to use these priceless guarantees be sure they do not abuse them.

Hitler would not permit one score persons in Germany to hold secret meetings and parade in public carrying the American flag and pledge their support to the United States Government and at the same time denounce Hitler and his Government. Why then should we permit 500,000 people in this country to do that same thing and threaten the overthrow of this Government? There is no freedom of speech, of the press, of assembly, or of religion in Russia under Stalin. Not even a citizen in Germany, Russia, or Italy is permitted to speak or write against their respective countries or against Stalin, Hitler, or Mussolini. Now, why should we permit a lot of Communists from Russia or elsewhere who hate religion, who hate this Government, and desire to see it overthrown and a communistic dictatorship established to organize on American soil, march under the red flag of communism, and engage in subversive propaganda and activities for the purpose of destroying our Government?

We are spending now more than a billion dollars a year for national defense. Why build a great navy to protect us from foreign attacks and at the same time take a lot of these foreign enemies into our bosom to destroy us?

This investigation should be thorough and fair. The American people are entitled to know what these alien and foreign-minded Americans are up to and who it is that is furnishing the brains and the money to build up these un-American organizations in this country, and then Congress should not hesitate to pass such measures as are necessary to protect our country—should not hesitate to apprehend and send out of this country its enemy aliens.

Our country is the only nation of the world that is providing jobs or relief for millions of aliens. If these aliens and alien-minded Americans desire to serve Hitler, Stalin, Mussolini, and other dictators and desire to affiliate with the Communist, Nazi-ist, and Fascist Parties, they should leave this country and go to the foreign countries where they can enjoy all the oppression of dictators. [Applause.]

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, for the first time since I have been a Member of this body, I make the point of order a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. One hundred and forty-nine Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House. A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 91]

Anderson, Mo.	Daly	Jacobsen	Scott
Andrews	Delaney	Kerr	Shafer, Mich.
Arnold	DeMuth	Lanzetta	Smith, Okla.
Atkinson	Ditter	Lesinski	Steagall
Barden	Doughton	Lewis, Md.	Sullivan
Bland	Douglas	Long	Summers, Tex.
Buckley, N. Y.	Drew, Pa.	Lucas	Sweeney
Bulwinkle	Elliott	McGroarty	Taylor, Colo.
Burch	Fish	McMillan	Thomason, Tex.
Byrne	Fitzpatrick	Maas	Thurston
Cannon, Wis.	Flannery	Martin, Mass.	Tinkham
Champion	Gasque	Mitchell, Tenn.	Vincent, Ky.
Chandler	Gifford	Moster, Ohio	Vinson, Ga.
Chapman	Gildea	Mouton	Wearin
Clark, N. C.	Gray, Ind.	Norton	Weaver
Claypool	Gray, Pa.	O'Connell, R. I.	White, Idaho
Cole, Md.	Greenwood	O'Connor, Mont.	Wilcox
Cole, N. Y.	Griswold	O'Day	Wolcott
Cox	Hancock, N. Y.	Oliver	Wolfenden
Crosby	Hartley	Pettengill	Wood
Crosser	Hoffman	Pierce	Woodruff
Crowther	Holmes	Polk	
Culkin	Honeyman	Rich	
Curley	Hunter	Rogers, Okla.	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 333 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, this is a serious question which confronts the Congress as the only organization of the Government which can deal with it. The executive department cannot, the judicial department cannot, and it is, typically, a question for Congress as to whether or not they are going to stand by the present form of Government and prevent this un-American activity that is rampant in our Nation. That it would, if successful, ultimately destroy our democratic form of government many of us feel sure.

There is no question here of Jew or German. That issue is exaggerated. It is, in national effect, very minor, so I hope that no Members will be influenced by the German vote in their districts, because I have, proportionately, as many Germans in my district as any Member of this House. Moreover do I hope that no Member will be influenced by the number of Jewish citizens in his district, because while I have, substantially, no Jews in my district, I am deeply concerned that no anti-Semitism arise anywhere in my own State of New York or in any State of the Union.

This question simmers down to an un-American activity in our midst. There is no question but what a radical movement is sweeping this country. It is represented principally by the Communist movement. The allies of the Communists have joined forces. If you do not believe this is true, you have not observed what has been going on in recent years. There are millions of people parading our streets waving red flags seeking to undermine our Government. Violence has already occurred on our streets.

Some reference was made here today to me personally and about the Communists picketing my home last night. That is not unusual. That happens about once a month. Of course, under the law they have no right to picket my home because I have no labor dispute with anybody, but so powerful is this group with high Government officials that the police are forbidden to enforce the laws.

Let me read some extracts from a letter just received by me today:

Congressman JOHN O'CONNOR,
Chairman, House Rules Committee, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'CONNOR: The Communists picketed your home this evening and distributed the enclosed circular, also held a mass meeting at the corner of Third Avenue and Thirty-fifth Street—

That is within 100 feet of my home—

I have deposited affidavits accumulated during 2 years that I have been studying communism from the inside that will lead to

congressional investigation of communism and in time of war would send many to the firing squad.

Mail is no longer safe, as there is a Communist within every New York City branch post office. In the office or at the phone of every large industry there is a Communist spy. They claim a unit in the New York Fire Department.

No one is safe on W. P. A. in New York City who does not join the C. P. The light, heat, water, and power plants of the Nation are at the mercy of Communist spies.

Official orders from Moscow called for the enlistment of Communists in the Army, Navy, National Guard, and R. O. T. C. This order was issued officially December 28, 1937.

They now propose to communize the railroad unions by official instructions so that by tying up the railroads they control all major and basic industries and movement of food, etc.

Little do the people of this Nation realize what is happening, but they are due for an awakening. Let's hope not too late.

The proposed constitution to be adopted at the tenth national convention, convening the 26th in New York City, is a deliberate fake.

Under protection I will go before Congress and testify to the nefarious plans of communism toward America and its people.

They are a secret organization. They are teaching in secret that the Constitution is merely to create a quasi-legal status to fight "red baiting."

Three thousand members in the Sixteenth Congressional District will make a house-to-house canvass against you, as stated at the street meeting tonight.

Incidentally the Hague case was built by the Communists to destroy the Democratic Party in New Jersey and arranged by Communists on W. P. A. who, while working for W. P. A., were devoting the time building communism. One Mike Kantor has been assigned by the Communist Party to locate at Pittsburgh, Pa., and bring on the same situation that was developed at Jersey City. I worked for 12 years on the late New York World and supplied advance information of the proposed activities of the Communist Party in Jersey.

And, incidentally, right in New York today, about 21 spies of a foreign nation are about to be indicted. Millions of dollars have admittedly been spent by that nation in our country for propaganda purposes.

Within a month or so our National Guard of New York has tried to weed out the Communists who had deliberately enlisted in our armed force.

All this is a great compliment to me. If ever I were defeated for public office, it is my solemn wish that I go down to defeat fighting the Communists, the enemies of our Government and all religion. I have here a great headline in one of the great papers of New York, the Herald Tribune, which says:

O'CONNOR first on the blacklist of Communists in America.

Few men are paid that compliment, decreed by the National Organization of the Communists of America on instructions from Russia.

I contemplate using as my epitaph "JOHN O'CONNOR, public enemy No. 1 of the Communists."

Mr. Speaker, as I stated in the beginning, the matter rests wholly with us in Congress.

It is a sad commentary, but the fact is that some of our Departments of Government are replete with Communists. They have wormed their way in through diverse means—often, I regret to say, because of the leanings and the sympathies of the heads of some of our agencies. The people of our country do not generally know this, but they should, and as far as my feeble voice can carry they will know it, and at the appropriate time I shall name names.

Even the heads of some of our departments are Communists or have similar leanings. For instance, the head of one of the greatest governmental departments was a registered Socialist in New York City. He will not deny that.

Mr. BIERMANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa for a brief question.

Mr. BIERMANN. Is the gentleman prepared to answer whether or not that is Harry Hopkins?

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. The matter to which I refer is officially recorded in the board of elections of the city of New York.

It is the Congress alone that is able to save this Government of ours from this destructive movement which has grown up tremendously during this depression so that it

MAY 25, 1938.

is now a dangerous radical un-American movement throughout the country. We just must stop it now. We must investigate its strength, its sources, its activities, and its leaders, in high or low places.

I have heard the argument made here that this is an anti-German movement. It is absolutely not. I would be no party to such an un-American movement. The decent German people of our country are against what this so-called bund, headed by one Fritz Kuhn, is doing. The decent people of our country—Jew, German, Irish, American, and all the other racial stocks—are against the Communist movement. If any gentleman thinks this radical, un-American movement has not grown during these last few years, and sometimes by encouragement from high places, then he has not looked around and observed the obvious facts.

Why, Mr. Speaker, I saw 50,000 people march through our streets with the red flags of communism. They were of all races and all colors. We in Congress here are the only ones who can do our duty to our established Government by investigating this monster and stopping this conflagration before it sweeps us out of control of our Government. I am not talking about any political party. I am talking about my country, and in the last analysis I do not care what party is in power if the fate of my country is concerned. But I do not want to see any group that is against our republican form of government get control of these United States. [Applause.]

That is why we are here today debating this subject. We are here to protect our own Government, which we swore to protect when we took our oath before this Speaker's desk. Let us not go off on any tangent; let us do our duty as American citizens, whether we be Democrats, Republicans, or Progressives. Let us save this country—and I am serious—let us save it from this horde of radicals, this horde of Communists, before the hour becomes too late. [Applause.]

Mr. WARREN rose.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina for the purpose of offering an amendment.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] controls the time, and he has yielded to the gentleman from North Carolina to offer an amendment.

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BOILEAU. How much time remains in control of the gentleman from Texas?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is advised that 1 minute and a half remains of general debate.

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MAVERICK. If an amendment be offered by agreement with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] from the Committee on Rules, does that mean that the resolution is open to amendment by all Members?

The SPEAKER. It does not, necessarily.

Mr. MAVERICK. The parliamentary inquiry I want to make is, under the rules, if one particular man in charge of the time permits a certain amendment, has he the power to arbitrarily deny that privilege to others who wish to offer amendments?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman in charge of the resolution, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], under the rules has the right to yield to any Member for the purpose of offering an amendment. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] if he does not desire to yield to other gentlemen for the purpose of offering an amendment, can move the previous question. If in the judgment of the House the previous question should not be ordered, the House can vote down the motion for the previous question, which would throw the resolution open to further germane amendments.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MICHENER. Going further along the line the Speaker has suggested, if the chairman of the Committee on Rules yields for an amendment, and that amendment is offered, then the amendment is subject to debate, for and against, under the rules of the House, is it not?

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] in charge of the resolution, yields to the gentleman from North Carolina for the purpose of offering an amendment, the gentleman from North Carolina would be entitled to control 1 hour on the amendment. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WARREN: Page 2, line 18, insert: "Sec. 2. The committee shall file its report with the House on January 3, 1939, or may file the same earlier in the event the House is not in session with the Speaker of the House, for printing as a public document."

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Speaker, that is the amendment which was mentioned earlier in debate, and which the gentleman from Texas said he would be glad to accept.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the amendment and the resolution to final passage.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas, ordering the previous question on the amendment of the gentleman from North Carolina and on the resolution to final passage.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BOILEAU. Is it not possible, before the gentleman from Texas moves the previous question, to have recognition in opposition to the amendment?

The SPEAKER. It is not, unless the gentleman from Texas withdraws his motion for the previous question.

Mr. BOILEAU. No such opportunity can be had?

The SPEAKER. Not under the rules.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BOILEAU) there were—ayes 191, noes 41.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

The resolution was adopted, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on the resolution just passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and to include therein a brief newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on two subjects and to include certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, would it be in order to ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes?

The SPEAKER. Not at this juncture. The Chair has agreed to recognize the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LAMNECK], and can now entertain only requests to extend remarks.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and to include therein a short explanatory statement of the agricultural situation.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
There was no objection.

Mr. BINDERUP, Mr. WHITE of Ohio, and Mr. DUNN asked and were given permission to revise and extend their own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BIERMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD what I consider to be an able discussion of the subject of fascism that appeared in the Des Moines Register of May 20.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and to include therein a letter and accompanying document received from Mr. Packard, president of the Vermont Farm Bureau Federation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the legislative program of the day and other special orders, that I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

WORLD POULTRY CONGRESS, CLEVELAND, 1939

Mr. LAMNECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 10155) to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Seventh World's Poultry Congress and Exposition, Cleveland, Ohio, 1939, to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes. This bill has been unanimously reported by the Ways and Means Committee.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from Ohio explain the bill?

Mr. LAMNECK. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill to permit the importation of exhibits in connection with a poultry exposition that will be held in Cleveland, Ohio, in the year 1939, beginning in July. It follows the customary action taken in connection with all other expositions of a similar nature. It provides that no tariff shall be assessed against imports in connection with the exposition.

Mr. MAPES. I understand it is unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. LAMNECK. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAPES. I yield.

Mr. TREADWAY. Is it not also a fact that this courtesy has been extended by Congress to foreign exhibitors in the case of other expositions?

Mr. LAMNECK. This is exactly the same kind of resolution.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAPES. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. Is it not also true that this is a reciprocal courtesy extended between countries in the case of international expositions?

Mr. LAMNECK. That is correct.

Mr. BIERMANN. Are these chickens raised by the cheap foreign labor that the Republicans are so afraid of?

Mr. LAMNECK. I do not know anything about that.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all articles which shall be imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the international exposition to be held at Cleveland, Ohio, beginning in July 1939, by the Seventh World's Poultry Congress and Exposition, or for use in constructing, installing, or maintaining foreign buildings or exhibits

at the said exposition, upon which articles there shall be a tariff or customs duty shall be admitted without payment of such tariff, customs duty, fees, or charges under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe; but it shall be lawful at any time during and/or within 3 months after the close of the said exposition to sell within the area of the exposition any articles provided for herein, subject to such regulations for the security of the revenue and for the collection of import duties as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe: *Provided*, That all such articles, when withdrawn for consumption or use in the United States, shall be subject to the duties, if any, imposed upon such articles by the revenue laws in force at the date of their withdrawal; and on such articles, which shall have suffered diminution or deterioration from incidental handling or exposure, the duties, if payable, shall be assessed according to the appraised value at the time of withdrawal from entry hereunder for consumption or entry under the general tariff law: *Provided further*, That imported articles provided for herein shall not be subject to any marking requirements of the general tariff laws, except when such articles are withdrawn for consumption or use in the United States, in which case they shall not be released from customs custody until properly marked, but no additional duty shall be assessed because such articles were not sufficiently marked when imported into the United States: *Provided further*, That at any time during or within 3 months after the close of the exposition any article entered hereunder may be abandoned to the Government or destroyed under customs supervision, whereupon any duties on such article shall be remitted: *Provided further*, That articles, which have been admitted without payment of duty for exhibition under any tariff law and which have remained in continuous customs custody or under a customs exhibition bond, and imported articles in bonded warehouses under the general tariff law may be accorded the privilege of transfer to and entry for exhibition at the said exposition under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe: *And provided further*, That the Seventh World's Poultry Congress and Exposition shall be deemed, for customs purposes only, to be the sole consignee of all merchandise imported under the provisions of this act, and that the actual and necessary customs charges for labor, services, and other expenses in connection with the entry, examination, appraisement, release, or custody, together with the necessary charges for salaries of customs officers and employees in connection with the supervision, custody of, and accounting for articles imported under the provisions of this act, shall be reimbursed by the Seventh World's Poultry Congress and Exposition to the Government of the United States under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, and that receipts from such reimbursements shall be deposited as refunds to the appropriation from which paid, in the manner provided for in section 524, Tariff Act of 1930.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL FIREARMS ACT

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 9610) to amend the National Firearms Act.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of the bill? What does it do?

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, this bill has been reported unanimously by the Ways and Means Committee. It has for its purpose relief from an excessive tax which has paralyzed a small but reliable concern producing a certain type double-barreled firearm used principally by scientists. One barrel is 22 caliber and the other 44 caliber, a 4-10, used for fine shot on birds. The Department of Justice agrees that these arms have a very legitimate purpose and were not intended to be restricted under the National Firearms Act, which was passed to curtail or restrict the sale of sawed-off shotguns, machine guns, and firearms of that kind. Under the circumstances the Department agreed to go along, and made a favorable recommendation. There is no controversy over the bill.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman if he has received any complaints from sportsmen's organizations in opposition to this bill?

Mr. DINGELL. This has nothing to do with what the gentleman has in mind. It is an entirely different matter.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, if I understand the gentleman correctly, this is not the bill

prepared by the Attorney General for the purpose of requiring the registration of firearms?

Mr. DINGELL. Not at all. This has nothing to do with the registration bill pertaining to pistols and other kinds of firearms.

Mr. CRAWFORD. But this does have the approval of the Attorney General?

Mr. DINGELL. It does have the approval of the Attorney General and the control is still in the hands of the Government insofar as tracing shipments and sale of this type of rifle is concerned. It is really a double-barreled proposition.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does this in any way affect collectors of guns or those who have collections of guns? Are they required to register?

Mr. DINGELL. No; it has nothing to do with that. As a matter of fact, we seek to bring about relief by permitting the sale of this type of gun which is used very largely by scientists.

Mr. O'MALLEY. This in no way affects the sportsman's possession of small arms, rifles, or pistols?

Mr. DINGELL. It does not in any way.

Mr. O'MALLEY. I have had some communications in reference to that.

Mr. DINGELL. Yes; we have had some communications in that connection, too, but this has nothing to do with that matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (a) of section 2 of the National Firearms Act, relating to registration and licensing of importer, manufacturer, and dealer, is amended by striking out the period at the end of the paragraph and inserting a colon and the following: "Provided, That such license shall not apply to any gun with two attached barrels from which only a single discharge can be made from either barrel without manual reloading: *Provided further,* That either barrel is 12 inches or more in length."

Sec. 2. That subsection (a) of section 3, relating to the tax rate of "firearms", is amended by striking out the period at the end of the paragraph and inserting a colon and the following: "Provided, That the transfer tax shall not be in excess of \$1 on any gun with two attached barrels from which only a single discharge can be made from either barrel without manual reloading: *Provided further,* That either barrel is 12 inches or more in length."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, after the word "act", insert "approved June 26, 1934."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "such license shall not apply to" and insert "the manufacturer's license shall not be in excess of \$25 and that the dealer's license shall not be in excess of \$1 on."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'MALLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein a summary of my voting record and the bills I have introduced during the Seventy-fifth Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

RADIO MONOPOLY INVESTIGATION NEEDED

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the Record a statement which I made before the Rules Committee today in connection with a resolution to investigate the radio monopoly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Speaker, I make the following statement today before the House Rules Committee advocating the investigation of the communications monopoly:

Mr. Chairman, on last Thursday, upon your invitation, I made a statement before your committee advocating your favorable consideration of the resolutions to investigate the radio monopoly. Before completing this statement, it was necessary for the committee to adjourn because of the early meeting of the House.

In concluding my statement to you, I would like to point out that since my statement was given to your committee, I have received a telegram from one of the elected representatives of the people, admitting he was perhaps the one referred to by stating that he had conferred with counsel for the Radio Corporation of America to have the antitrust suit of the Government continued until after the general election. He makes further statements concerning his law firm, which are entirely out of line with the statements I have in affidavit form. This admission on his part places on your committee the additional responsibility of the necessity of an investigation to go thoroughly into the corruption and debauchery practiced by the radio monopoly.

According to inquiry made by some members of the committee, it seems to be overlooked that corruption not only included elected representatives of the people but also those filling judicial offices.

Let me further call to your attention that the consent decree entered into between the United States Government and the radio monopoly in 1932 in effect perpetrated this monopoly, as is well recognized by the vice president of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., as shown from pages 193 and 194 of Television; a Struggle for Power. Speaking of the proposed consent decree, Mr. Jewett said:

"Thus, while a casual reading of the agreement by one not thoroughly conversant with all the factors may appear to establish the basis for an enlarged free development in most of the fields, this is not actually the case."

Mr. G. E. Folk, general patent attorney of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., assured his company that the consent decree in no way imperiled their monopolistic rights with this statement:

"Would we wish to grant to others the right, for example, to compete with us under our patents in our present field of long-distance communication, both wire and wireless telephony and telegraphy?"

Last week I called your attention and wish to again stress the importance of the debauchery practiced upon the investors in radio stock. The financial audit made of Radio Corporation of America showed that 6,580,375 shares of stock, with a market value of \$290,000,000, were issued to General Electric and Westinghouse, electrical manufacturers, which two companies at that time controlled, both by stock and by representation on the board of directors the Radio Corporation of America. That 6,580,375 shares of stock, with a value at date of issue of \$290,000,000, were issued to General Electric and Westinghouse for assets stated to have been worth \$39,900,000. This \$39,900,000 was subsequently written down to some \$24,000,000; that preferred stock, with redemption value of \$80,000,000 and an annual dividend rate of more than \$4,000,000, was issued by Radio Corporation of America in consideration of some \$17,000,000.

Incidentally, Mr. Chairman, some 2,000,000 shares of stock of Radio Corporation of America, which was turned over to General Electric as part of the original deal, and which was canceled at the time of this consent decree, was never returned to Radio Corporation of America. In passing, I might say that the common-stock holders had been fleeced in dividend earnings of \$28,000,000, while the corporation earned less than \$12,000,000.

Further, as a result of this infamous consent decree the General Electric and Westinghouse Cos. received a total rental each year of approximately one and one-half million dollars simply because they happen to have owned radio licenses issued for periods of 6 months and it had been leased over a 10-year period to their then owned 100-percent subsidiary.

Not only have the stockholders of R. C. A. been fleeced, but competitors of R. C. A. have been bankrupt. At the time this consent decree was entered into there were some 125 licensees of R. C. A., while today I understand the number has been reduced to 5, and of these 5 it is a question as to how many of them are controlled by R. C. A.

In other words, gentlemen, the monopoly is more airtight in the communications field today than ever before, and while we are talking about doing something about monopoly here are facts before us not only of monopoly, but debauchery and corruption for profit.

The recent telephone investigation clearly shows how the monopoly has thrived under the consent decree. It says in part:

"The chief criticism has been that these agreements have fostered monopolies in a number of fields foreign to the primary field of the telephone company by effectuating the pooling of the thousands of patents owned by the parties by dividing between the parties the many fields in which the patents have application, and by throwing into the patents of others desiring to engage in these fields the obstacle presented by the combined patent and financial resources of the telephone companies—the Western Co., the General Electric Co., the Radio Corporation of America, and the Westinghouse."

Speaking of the 1932 agreement which was accepted by the court in the consent decree, Eilan Miller, staff engineer of the Telephone Co., characterizes the new agreement as follows:

"We are in a position to enter any field we choose so far as our own patents are concerned; however, the extent to which we can enter any field from which we were formerly excluded depends upon our ability to effectively carry out such a program under our own patents or patent rights, and it is, of course, evident that the patents of the radio group play an important part in those fields which they formerly exclusively controlled."

In closing, gentlemen, let me remind you that this great monopoly existing in the communications field which controls the molding of public opinion in this country cannot and will not be broken up

unless your committee approves investigation resolutions which will permit the exposure of these known existing evils so that the people of this country may know the truth. Free press, free speech, freedom of thought and action are imperiled unless your committee acts favorably on these resolutions at this session.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a letter written to me and my answer thereto.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the majority leader what will come up tomorrow?

Mr. RAYBURN. Bills on the Private Calendar will be called; then we will proceed to the consideration of the omnibus claims bill, part of which we considered some time ago.

Mr. MAPES. Will any other omnibus bills be brought up except the one that we partially considered the other day?

Mr. RAYBURN. No. The gentleman from California [Mr. BUCK] has a bill which I understand has the unanimous report of the Committee on Ways and Means. He expects to ask unanimous consent the first thing tomorrow to have that bill considered. There is nothing else I know of for tomorrow.

Mr. MAPES. Is it planned to adjourn from tomorrow until next Tuesday?

Mr. RAYBURN. Yes.

Mr. MAPES. I have been requested to ask if the House will meet at 12 tomorrow?

Mr. RAYBURN. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous special order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] is recognized for 20 minutes.

PROPOSED FEDERAL TAX COMMISSION

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, the President has well said that "taxes have grown up like Topsy in this country."

It seems to be universally conceded that the Federal tax system needs a very thorough overhauling. Every tax bill in recent years has been rushed through Congress without adequate examination and analysis, or careful consideration as to its probable effect either on taxpayers or on the revenue. As a result, we have a hodgepodge of tax laws which are steadily becoming more incoherent and more complex. Sound principles of taxation have been abandoned. The taxing power has been used for other than revenue purposes, and rates have been increased far beyond the point of diminishing returns. There has been no stability whatever either in the forms or incidence of taxation. More and more, the bounds of Federal and State taxation have been allowed to overlap.

On numerous occasions in the past, studies and investigations have been made of the Federal tax system with a view to its improvement and simplification, but no lasting progress has been made along this line. Doubtless one reason for the failure of past investigating bodies to accomplish much has been the restricted composition of their membership. In every case, they have been composed either of Members of Congress or representatives of the Treasury, or both, and naturally they have been somewhat biased in favor of existing laws which the Members had helped to draft or administer. Of course, political expediency also has been a factor.

In order to accomplish some of the reforms in taxation which long have been sought but never achieved, I have today introduced a joint resolution calling for the appointment of a nonpartisan Federal Tax Commission, to be composed of 10 members 4 of whom would be Members of the House and Senate, and 6 of whom would be appointed by the President as representatives of agriculture, labor, business and industry, individual taxpayers and consumers, tax lawyers and accountants, and tax economists. Later on in these remarks I shall discuss the reasons which impelled me to set up a commission of this sort.

The first section of the resolution contains a declaration of policy, covering 10 different items. I shall refer to each of these items briefly.

First. It is declared to be the policy of Congress "to establish a stable, more permanent Federal tax policy." One of the principal troubles with our tax policy in recent years has been that we have really had no definite tax policy. It certainly should be possible to establish some fixed principles of taxation which could be adhered to for at least a few years, with such changes in rates and exemptions as the revenue needs might dictate. In the last 4 years we have had four different methods of corporate taxation. Under the Revenue Act of 1934, corporations paid a flat tax upon their net income. Under the Revenue Act of 1935, the President's graduated corporate income tax was adopted. Before this tax ever went into effect, Congress adopted the President's plan for an undistributed-profits tax. Under the bill recently passed, we have still another form of taxation, in which small corporations are treated one way and large corporations another, with a combination of treatment for corporations in between the two groups. It is no wonder that business cannot face the future confidently. Taxation is an important factor in corporate planning, and while business can usually adjust itself to changing rates of taxation, it must have reasonable assurance of the character and basis of such taxation.

Second. It is declared to be the policy of Congress "to raise the necessary revenue for the support of the Government with the least possible burden on individual taxpayers and business enterprises." This item needs no explanation. While taxes are a necessary evil, they should not be levied and collected in such a manner as to oppress or unduly burden the taxpayer. The unlamented undistributed-profits tax was of this character.

Third. It is declared to be the policy of Congress "to give due regard to the natural economic law of diminishing returns in fixing tax rates." We have learned by experience that there is a point beyond which an increased rate of taxation will produce less revenue. In the opinion of many, the highest brackets of the income tax have already passed this point. Excessive rates not only dry up the sources of revenue but tend to drive investments into tax-exempt securities. Or, as in the case of the capital-gains tax, they may prevent taxable transactions from being entered into. The recent action by Congress in putting a 15-percent ceiling on the taxation of capital gains—a principle long advocated by the Republican minority—was a belated recognition of the law of diminishing returns as applied to such transactions.

Fourth. It is declared to be the policy of Congress "to base Federal taxes, insofar as may be practicable and expedient, upon the principle of ability to pay." This is a fundamental rule of equitable taxation. The income tax is based on this principle, and if my resolution should be agreed to, it would be within the province of the commission to go into the question of the possible broadening of the tax base so as to extend this principle somewhat further than its present narrow limits.

I realize, of course, that we probably cannot do away with all taxes which are not based on ability to pay. Some taxes, like the taxes on liquor and tobacco, probably would have to be continued.

Fifth. It is declared to be the policy of Congress "to eliminate insofar as possible indirect and hidden taxes." With so many taxes of this type on the statute books, the taxpayer never knows just how much he is paying for the luxury of being governed. Last November I presented to the House certain data showing the extent of the so-called "hidden-tax burden." It was shown that the man with only \$80 monthly income, who owned no automobile and no real estate, paid \$116 a year in hidden taxes. The man with \$150 monthly income, who owned a second-hand car and no real estate, paid an annual total of \$229 in hidden taxes. Of course, these figures included Federal, State, and local taxation, but the Federal share is approximately one-half the total.

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMAS] has introduced a resolution which would require that food commodities be labeled in such a manner as to show the amount of taxes hidden in the purchase price. It would not be a bad idea to extend this requirement to all commodities. If this were done, the great masses of our people, who have been led to believe that the rich were paying for the cost of government, would have revealed to them the startling information that it is really they who are bearing the major portion of the tax burden.

If our people were made more conscious of the tax burden that they are actually but unwittingly bearing, there would probably be less pressure on the Government for appropriations.

Sixth. It is declared to be the policy of Congress "to simplify the Federal tax system, including the forms of taxation, the statement of the law, and the methods of administration." Simplification of the tax laws has long been one of my hobbies. I regret to say, however, that the work of simplification which was originally carried out by the Joint Committee on Taxation has largely been undone in recent years. I know it has been said, and properly so, that you cannot have simple tax laws applying to our complex business structure. But there is such a thing as making our tax laws unnecessarily complex. For example, the tax on corporations could just as well be levied on net income at either a flat or graduated rate. Instead, Congress has just passed a bill which sets up as complicated a scheme of corporation taxation as has ever been devised, and for no good reason except to continue the vicious principle of taxing undistributed earnings. Under the new bill the tax is simple enough for corporations of \$25,000 or less net income, but when they get above this figure the trouble begins.

A flat tax on corporations would have required less than one page of the law to state. The new law covers 16 pages of complicated text, including the Chinese puzzle "notch provisions," the dividends-paid credit, the consent-dividends credit, and so on. This new law will be a bonanza for tax lawyers and accountants, but it will be a headache for the taxpayer.

Admitting that it is not possible to have tax laws that can be read and understood by school children, nevertheless it is possible to have a relative degree of simplicity. Congress does not have to go out of its way to make the law complex and ambiguous.

Seventh. It is declared to be the policy of Congress "to alleviate hardships and inequities in the application and administration of the internal-revenue laws." This item is self-explanatory. No one will deny that these hardships and inequities exist. The recent revenue revision was only a partial step in their elimination. Much work along this line remains to be done.

Eighth. It is declared to be the policy of Congress "to minimize double taxation by coordinating the Federal tax system with those of the State and local governments." Multiple taxation is steadily becoming a more and more serious problem. With the States and local communities, on the one hand, seeking out every possible source of revenue, and with the Federal Government, on the other hand, doing the same thing, it is natural that there has been a great deal of overlapping. There is need for some definite allocation of the tax field to the various taxing authorities. It has been stated that in the United States today there exist some 175,000 different taxing units. Of course, not all of them levy on the same taxpayers, but we do have many clear-cut cases of duplicate taxation on the part of the Federal and State Governments, particularly in the case of incomes, estates, liquor, tobacco, and certain other outstanding examples.

This subject is one which is really worthy of a separate and independent study. However, the commission which I propose could very well make a preliminary investigation and possibly make some recommendations for at least partially correcting the existing duplication.

Ninth. It is declared to be the policy of Congress "to prevent tax evasion and avoidance." Some work along this line

was done by the Hill subcommittee in 1934 and by the Joint Committee on Tax Evasion and Avoidance in 1937, but a great deal has been left undone. Two of the methods of legal tax avoidance referred to in the President's message in 1937, namely, percentage depletion and community property, were passed over "for lack of time." The matter of tax-exempt securities and tax-exempt salaries might also very well come within the jurisdiction of the proposed tax commission. I have long advocated a constitutional amendment to deal with this particular problem, but if the matter can be handled by legislation, as suggested by the President, so much the better. It may be that the decision of the Supreme Court last Monday in the Port of New York Authority case portends a change of attitude on the part of the Court if the issue is squarely presented to it. At any rate, the proposed commission could give consideration to the matter and make a recommendation one way or the other.

Tenth. The last item is more or less of a "basket clause," declaring it to be the policy of Congress "to make such other changes as will improve the Federal internal revenue system." It is of course impossible to detail in advance all the possible improvements that could be made. The commission would not be confined to the specific items set forth in the resolution.

In setting up the commission I have tried to keep the number as small as possible, considering the broad composition of the membership. I have provided for four congressional Members, two from the House and two from the Senate, in each case one from the majority and one from the minority party. Congress certainly should have representation on such a commission. Moreover, in keeping with its nonpartisan character, I have given the minority equal representation. Of course, it must be remembered that the commission would have no power to legislate, but only to recommend. Hence the majority party would have the opportunity to approve, reject, or alter any recommendations which might be made. Under the terms of the resolution, the congressional Members would be chosen by the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee.

The other six members of the commission would be made up of representatives of different groups interested in the tax problem, to be appointed by the President. One would be a representative of agriculture, one of labor, one of industry, one of business and industry, one of individual taxpayers and consumers, one of tax lawyers and accountants, and one of tax economists. In this way, the problems to be investigated would be approached from a number of different viewpoints. Agriculture has its problems, labor its problems, and business and industry their problems. Likewise, individual taxpayers and consumers have a viewpoint to be represented. Tax lawyers and accountants are familiar with the problems that arise in the administration of the law. Tax economists have in mind the underlying principles of sound taxation.

In the past, tax revisions have to a large extent represented too much of the Treasury viewpoint. While it is true that public hearings have been held, they have usually been called on short notice, and without any bill prepared, and taxpayers have not had ample opportunity to present their views. Moreover, after the hearings are over and the committee sits in executive session to draft a bill, the Treasury representatives are present to reassert their views and criticize the viewpoint of taxpayers, without any opportunity for the latter to counteract this influence. I have purposely omitted naming any Treasury representative on the commission for the reason that the Treasury can appear before the commission in public hearings, and of course it will later have the opportunity to appear before the Ways and Means Committee and Senate Finance Committee in secret executive session.

Numerous organizations have urged the appointment of a tax commission along the general lines of the one set up in my resolution. The American Farm Bureau Federation, for example, has criticized past tax commissions because they have not included representatives of the "major economic

interests," agriculture, industry, and labor. My resolution gives even broader representation than the Farm Bureau recommends. The National Association of Manufacturers has recommended as follows:

We, therefore, suggest that a nonpartisan national commission be appointed to undertake a comprehensive study of the entire Federal, State, and local tax systems and make recommendations for its improvement and simplification. Such a committee should be composed of representatives of the Congressional Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, the Treasury Department, major branches of productive enterprise, and of independent tax economists.

It should consider both principles and particular forms of taxation, and the manner in which they affect the taxpayer, who must continue to have income if the Government is to have revenue. Such a commission as we propose should endeavor to present constructive suggestions for the elimination of what the President in his 1936 tax message termed "inequalities in our system," including the lessening of tax duplications which operate to prevent proper distribution of tax burdens.

This would be the right approach to a problem of such magnitude. The recommendations of such a commission when acted upon by Congress would tend to take the principles of taxation out of the realm of yearly congressional tax revisions, with all of the accompanying uncertainties and disturbances. Congress would then need to regularly consider only the rates needed to secure necessary revenue. The effects of tax policies and burdens upon our economy are such that none can escape. They are of such paramount importance in the welfare of the Nation that every effort should be made to insulate the formulation of such tax policies from continual legislative adjustments.

I subscribe in general to this admirable statement. My resolution provides for the type of commission recommended, although differing in details.

Let me quote from one other organization, the American Institute of Accountants. In a brief filed in connection with the recent revenue revision, that organization states:

Will this revision approach the problem purely from the angle of increasing the revenue by further tightening of existing provisions or the introduction of further changes in form and incidence of taxation; or will there be a conscientious endeavor to simplify existing law, to determine sound principles in harmony with long-range economic principles, and in recognition of conservative business practices? Revisions of taxation may appear to reduce the potential revenue of the Treasury, but some changes are imperative to the very existence of many corporations and from that standpoint, as well as from the angle of renewed confidence and related stimulation of commerce, will increase the revenue. It seems desirable also to broaden the base of income taxation by the reduction of specific exemptions and otherwise, facilitated by an extension of the principle of withholding at the source. We do not presume to suggest that a simple tax may be devised. In such a case simplicity is relative. Nor do we have the temerity to propose that accountants could formulate fixed principles of income taxation which would be acceptable either to the Government or taxpayers as a whole. We do, however, seek participation in the solution of that problem.

My resolution endeavors to give these accountants, along with other groups, such participation.

Just one further word in closing. The study which my resolution contemplates would necessarily require a good deal of time. It should not be hurried. One trouble in the past has been that whenever those in control wanted to pass over some controversial item it would be done on the alleged excuse of lack of time. I want to give the commission plenty of time. Hence, I have provided that it shall have until January 3, 1941, to make a report. That is 2½ years. If necessary, the time can be extended further. Unless we give the commission plenty of time, it is a waste of effort and money to set it up.

Mr. Speaker, in offering my resolution, I do so as a means of stirring up public discussion of the important problem with which it deals, and in the hope that it will result in definite action being taken to bring about the much-needed overhauling of our tax structure. We have already waited too long to undertake this broad study, which would enable us to establish a more sound, more equitable, and more understandable tax system, and obviate the necessity for frequent changes in the forms and incidence of taxation, thereby encouraging business stability. [Applause.]

I shall now read the resolution I am introducing:

Resolved, etc., That it is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress—

- (1) To establish a stable, more permanent Federal tax policy;

- (2) To raise the necessary revenue for the support of the Government with the least possible burden on individual taxpayers and business enterprises;

- (3) To give due regard to the natural economic law of diminishing returns in fixing tax rates;

- (4) To base Federal taxes, insofar as may be practicable and expedient, upon the principle of ability to pay;

- (5) To eliminate, insofar as may be possible, indirect and hidden taxes;

- (6) To simplify the Federal tax system, including the forms of taxation, the statement of the law, and the methods of administration;

- (7) To alleviate hardships and inequities in the application and administration of the internal-revenue laws;

- (8) To minimize double taxation by coordinating the Federal tax system with those of the State and local governments;

- (9) To prevent tax evasion and avoidance; and

- (10) To make such other changes as will improve the Federal Internal Revenue System.

Sec. 2. There is hereby established a Federal Tax Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission") to be composed of 10 members, as follows:

- (1) Two members who are members of the Committee on Finance of the Senate, one from the majority and one from the minority party, to be chosen by such committee.

- (2) Two members who are members of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, one from the majority and one from the minority party, to be chosen by such committee.

- (3) Six members (none of whom holds any office in the Government of the United States or is engaged in the activities of any political party) to be chosen by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, one of whom shall be representative of agriculture, one of labor, one of business and industry, one of individual taxpayers and consumers, one of tax lawyers and accountants, and one of tax economists.

Sec. 3. It shall be the duty of the Commission—

- (1) To make such investigations as it may deem necessary or advisable in order to carry out the purposes of this resolution;

- (2) To publish from time to time, for public examination and analysis, proposed measures for carrying out the policy of Congress herein expressed; and

- (3) To report to the Congress from time to time, and in any event not later than January 3, 1941, the results of its investigations, together with such recommendations as it may have to make.

Sec. 4. (a) The Commission shall meet and organize as soon as practicable after at least a majority of the members have been chosen, and shall elect a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members, and shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of a secretary and such experts and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants as it deems advisable. A vacancy in the Commission shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the Commission, and shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection.

(b) The Commission is authorized to hold hearings and to sit and act at such places and times, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to have such printing and binding done, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services in reporting such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. Subpenas for witnesses shall be issued under the signature of the chairman or vice chairman.

(c) The Commission is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and agencies in the executive branch of the Government, of the Joint Congressional Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, and of the office of the Legislative Counsel.

(d) The Commission shall have the same right to obtain data and to inspect returns as the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Finance of the Senate, and to submit any relevant or useful information thus obtained to the Congress.

(e) The members of the Commission shall serve without compensation for such service, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(f) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated so much as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this resolution. Amounts appropriated for the expenses of the Commission shall be disbursed by the Division of Disbursement, Treasury Department, upon vouchers approved by the chairman or vice chairman.

(g) All authority conferred by this resolution shall terminate on the expiration of 3 years from the enactment of this resolution.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein certain items from Senate Document 156. This is a list of products on which the United States will consider granting concessions to Great Britain and our 1936 dutiable imports of each article according to the two

lists submitted by the State Department on January 8 and 24, showing the share of the United Kingdom and other countries in our total imports of each article listed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, however much the American people today are removed from the actual scenes of armed conflict raging over the world, they are not removed from the economic consequences that are flowing from those conflicts. We are face to face with their shattering force and effect, and we are paying a price of war in the economic terms of unemployment and depression and of disturbed and upset world conditions as certainly as if an armed foe had crossed our borders.

Today as a result of cheaply produced goods that are pouring through our ports, many of them either misbranded or counterfeits of commodities which our own factories are making, our country is being invaded by Japan in an economic way as certainly and as energetically as China is invaded by the military forces of Japan, with a rain of destruction and death upon Chinese cities and towns and upon unoffending civilian men, women, and children.

As the conditions of war with China force the industry of Japan to a basis of more intensified regimentation, a hand of disastrous and ruthless competition reaches across the Pacific to tighten upon our own national economy and to make war upon our industrial activity and our industrial employment.

In our own country we are struggling with the effects of a puzzling economic depression, which of itself has greatly increased the volume of unemployment and reduced the industrial activity and pay rolls upon which a large part of the American population is dependent for a livelihood. At the same time, the volume of imports of Japanese goods, made for the most part at a fraction of the costs of manufacture of similar American products, is rapidly increasing and reaching the highest level in our history.

Current reports of the Department of Commerce give indication of a vast increase in recent months in the volume of Japanese commodities and products coming into the United States. American exports to Japan have greatly increased in these months as well, according to these reports, but an increase that is confined almost wholly to two commodities—raw cotton and scrap iron. On the other hand, the increase in Japanese imports into the United States is confined almost exclusively to manufactured goods which come into direct competition with similar products that are being turned out by American mills and factories.

If the imports from Japan were truly Japanese; if they were the indigenous products of Japanese national skill, or so typically Japanese as to be unobtainable from any other source, it would make little practical difference to American wage earners and American employers what the conditions were under which the articles were produced or to what extent the volume of Japanese imports increased.

This, however, is not the case. The great bulk and volume of what we are getting from Japan today in manufactured products are articles which were originally invented and produced in the United States. They are imitations of American products, which have been counterfeited in Japan and are being sent into this country inferior in quality and brutally lower in price. The consequence is unquestionably to be read in the mounting toll of unemployment among our own industrial workers.

Since Japanese goods for the most part are copies of American products, they are not adding materially to the broad stock of goods obtainable in the American market. They are merely competing with real American products and displacing such products in the home market.

The competition of these imitations is not only a violation of trade practices and business ethics as recognized and adhered to in this country, but a direct attack as well upon American standards of living. It is needless to go into the deplorable conditions of labor under which such goods are

produced in Japan. They are to be found, with minute description, in almost every report of industrial conditions in Japan that comes to us. We know of the low wages, the long hours, the sweatshop conditions, and the rigorous employment under which goods are produced in the mills and factories of Japan.

Wage scales in this or any other country follow an inexorable law of price. This country or no other country can fill its markets with cheaply produced products and commodities of other lands and continue to pay high wages in the making of the same products, or for that matter, even continue to keep wage earners employed. Sooner or later standards of living and wage scales must succumb to the remorseless effects of such competition.

This explains in clear terms why the American standard of living is menaced today by the growing volume of Japanese products. This gives a clear indication of why the fate of China in the war with Japan has a direct bearing upon our own economic fortunes, for with China in the grip of Japan's industrial hierarchy, the threat of today promises to be multiplied and remultiplied in ratio to China's vast population and her great stores of raw materials and natural resources which must fall to the lot of Japanese industry and of Japanese exploitation.

The competition of cheaply produced Japanese products and imitations with American goods is not confined to our home markets. It extends into all of the foreign countries to which American products are shipped and with which we have a foreign trade. Only recently it came to my attention that a popular American brand of men's hosiery, with a trade-mark name of more than 20 years' standing, was meeting with competition in South American countries from a Japanese imitation selling for about one-fifth the price of the American product. A perfect imitation of the American label and trade-mark appeared on the Japanese product with the exception that the letter "v" in the second word of the trade name had been changed to "w." This difference was scarcely distinguishable because of the use of Old English lettering in the trade-mark.

I believe that some of the Members may recall that not so very long ago I had on the floor of the House those very trade-marks in order that you might compare the almost imperceptible difference. Anyone purchasing those stockings might easily be fooled.

The Japanese make matches which compete with the Swedish matches and they have named a place in Japan "Sweden," and also, of course, they compete with matches made in the United States of America. In buying the matches you see the "Sweden," and you do not notice underneath in tiny letters the word "Japan," so you believe when you are buying those matches that you are buying Swedish matches.

Mr. SEGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield for an observation?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SEGER. There is a hard-rubber company in my district that makes combs and has made them for 25 years. On these combs appear "USA" in gold. The Japanese have founded a city called Usa, and they put "USA" on their combs.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I believe that is probably the case with many commodities.

Mr. LUCKEY of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. LUCKEY of Nebraska. Is this the method to which Japan is resorting to pay for the scrap iron we are sending over there?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Japan was doing this before the scrap iron was sent over there, but, of course, in sending increased amounts of scrap iron and other commodities we were helping still more to carry on the war with China.

I hold in my hand two flags, one made in Japan and one made in the United States. I know it angers my colleagues just as it does me to see replicas of the Capitol, the White House, the Washington Monument, and the Lincoln Memorial bought by people who find on them, when they turn the objects over, the phrase "Made in Japan."

You see these flags I hold here? The one made in America is of better quality, but if people were buying a number of them, the one from Japan, of inferior quality, would do. Let me quote the prices on these flags. The heavy silk flag was made in America and the other in Japan. The American-made silk flag sells at \$18 a gross, while the Japanese product wholesales here at \$7.50 a gross, a difference of \$10.50 a gross. Anyone buying in large quantities would naturally buy the cheaper product. The American product usually retails at between 20 and 25 cents, while the Japanese article can be sold for as low as 7 cents. Naturally a purchaser, not realizing that it will make a difference to our workers, will buy the cheaper product. One does not notice these articles are imported, because they often are marked in such a way as to make it very difficult to distinguish the fact they are made in Japan.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. PIERCE. Is there a tariff on such articles, or do they come in free?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. A little later on I am going to bring out the tariff phase of the matter, but there is a tariff on these items.

The reason I refer you to this list of articles that will come under the proposed reciprocal-trade agreement with the United Kingdom is because the articles I have were on the agenda. If we negotiate a reciprocal-trade agreement with Great Britain, this china and these metallic articles you see here will all come under the provisions of that agreement, and Japan will receive an added advantage.

Mr. PIERCE. That is because of the most-favored-nation clause?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes; on account of the most-favored-nation clause. This is why I refer you to Senate Document 156, which was presented to the Senate by Senator O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming. There is shown in that document the volume of metallic objects that is coming in, and of kitchenware and china. I called the attention of the House some weeks ago to the hats made in Japan as compared with those made in this country. I do not have with me at this time the figures regarding the prices, but the ones made in Japan sell on the counters of the stores in the United States for a price much lower than the prices of felt hats made in this country. Of course, the felt is not so good in the Japanese hats.

I have in my hand a woolen sweater, and such objects are on the list of commodities that are being taken up in connection with the proposed treaty with Great Britain. One very interesting thing about this sweater is the fact that the "Made in Japan" on the zipper is taken off by a machine, so it is impossible to see the tag reading "Made in Japan."

(2) Woolen sweater: This article, it will be noted, has the "Made in Japan" stamp filed off the zipper slide. The practice of Japanese exporters filing off the "Made in Japan" stamp was the subject of an editorial in the foreign-events section of the New York Sunday Journal-American of May 1, a copy of which is attached.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Has the gentlewoman had her attention called to the fact that in Japan towns are being given American names?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I just brought out that fact.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am sorry, I did not hear it.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I shall be pleased to have the gentleman's comment on it, however.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I certainly believe we must approach as quickly as possible this problem the gentlewoman presents today.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I know from the gentleman's record he is vitally interested in this question. Among these exhibits is a piece of American vitrified hotel china, selling at \$1.28 per dozen, plus packing, at factory in West Virginia. The Japanese copy of this plate, with case and packing included, is 48 cents per dozen at factory.

We are an easygoing people. We are inclined to look with admiration upon this pretty pocket-size field glass, made in Japan, with adjustable lenses, all neatly packed, and selling, duty paid, in Boston and New York, for less than a dollar. We do not realize that this article was sold in Japan at wholesale for less than a quarter, and that a similar article made in this country must retail for many times the price at which this product is offered for sale. Without thinking of the harmful effects upon the workers who make binoculars in the United States, we are inclined to chuckle and say, "Wonderful! I do not see how they do it."

(3) Binoculars: It will be noted that the "Japan" name stamped on the binoculars has been painted over with black paint when the binoculars were made and is therefore hardly distinguishable. Frank X. A. Eble, formerly United States Customs Commissioner, who is now heading the "Made in America" Club, declared that when he was Customs Commissioner he insisted that all articles be clearly marked.

The flow of visitors and tourists to Washington each year is the largest source of business and revenue in the National Capital. The importance of the tourist business is exceeded by only one other factor—the pay rolls of the Federal Government.

Visitors and tourists to the National Capital spend hundreds of thousands of dollars annually for souvenirs and mementoes—little remembrances that will endure for a lifetime to remind them of happy days and hours spent in the environs of the dome of this Capitol and amid the scenes where some of the most inspiring and epochal events in our national history have taken place.

Here before me I have a collection of souvenirs of the National Capital, chosen at random in visits to the souvenir shops and the counters where reminders of Washington are offered to visitors and tourists. I have more than a score of these articles—metallic reproductions of this Capitol Building, of the White House, of the beautiful memorial to Abraham Lincoln, of the monument to the memory of George Washington—and each and every one of them bearing the label "Made in Japan."

I will give you a brief description of some of the commodities on the table beside me:

(4) Toy kazoo: These articles were obtained from the Kirchhof Patent Co., Newark, N. J. Mr. C. H. Dietze, executive head of the company, points out that the American-made product has been poorly copied by Japanese and that the Japanese product has a lead base so that a child, putting the kazoo into his mouth in case he had a cold sore or cut lip, or if he fell and cut himself with the toy, might easily obtain lead poisoning. The American-made product is made to sell for 5 cents and the Japanese product is sold in this country, after the duty is paid, at 1 cent.

(5) Toy badges: These are also made by the Kirchhof Patent Co. The one marked "Junior Fire Chief" with the horizontal clasp, as you will note, is a much better product and sells for 2 for 5 cents. The one with the vertical clasp is inferior and was made to sell for 1 cent. The important thing here is that the Japanese product was made as an exact duplicate of the American product. The Japanese product was introduced within 6 months from the time the American product was put on the market, and forced the Kirchhof Patent Co. to meet the competitive price.

(6) Pottery ware—teapot: The data on this hotel teapot is clearly shown on the card attached. This item, manufactured in Japan, as you will note, has a landed cost in the

United States of 86 cents per dozen. The American-made product, manufactured by the Hall China Co. of East Liverpool, Ohio, sells for \$4.16 a dozen. The Japanese again have clearly imitated the American-made product.

(7) American vitrified hotel china: This article, an American-made product, sells at \$1.28 per dozen, plus packing at the factory where it is made in West Virginia. The Japanese item, identical in style, shape, and design, sells for 48 cents per dozen.

(8) Japanese plate "B": This plate, a Japanese product, wholesales at 70 cents per dozen. The identical American product costs \$2 per dozen at the factory. The article sells at 15 cents, bringing the seller a 100-percent profit in spite of a 70-percent ad valorem duty and a specific duty of 10 cents per dozen. It is estimated shipping costs run about 16 cents per dozen.

(9) Grill plates: The Japanese article wholesales in San Francisco at \$1.80 to \$2 per dozen. This is plainly marked on the back of the broken plate. The American product, identical in size, shape, and so forth, wholesales at \$6.75 per dozen at the factory, package costs added.

(10) Taylor Smith blue plate (marked No. 4): The Japanese product retails at \$5 for a 53-piece set, while the American product at the factory costs \$6.21 for a 53-piece set.

Following are the glassware items which I have on the table at my side and the data on them:

(1) Marked No. 3: This Japanese-made article, picked up at S. H. Kress Co., New York, retails at 20 percent less than the American product which it imitates. The American manufacturers declare this retail price represents greater profit than the American price, as the cost to manufacture it in Japan is far less than the cost to manufacture here.

(2) Whisky glass: Two years ago Japan began to export to this country this product which is identical to an American-made whisky glass. The Japanese-made whisky glass sells at 3 for 10 cents, while it costs 10 cents retail for one of the American-made whisky glasses.

(3) This Japanese imitation of Libby glass cut ware (marked No. 5) sells at \$1.98 per dozen retail, while the American product must retail at \$2.50. Again the margin of profit to the seller is probably greater in the case of the Japanese product due to cheaper costs to manufacture.

(4) Identification mark No. 6: This glass is an interesting example of the fidelity with which the Japanese imitate the American products. You will note that there are bubbles in the stem of this glass. A couple of years ago, American manufacturers, through some error, permitted a number of their glasses of inferior quality to get on the market. The glasses were inferior because there were air bubbles in the stem. Shortly thereafter, Japan sent imitations of the product to be sold here, with the air bubbles faithfully reproduced. The price of this Japanese product, of course, runs below that of the American-made original.

The American people admire cleverness. We appreciate that substitutes may be shoddy, but when these cheap and often shoddy substitutes come into our markets in times of depression, and a growing volume of unemployment, when Americans are obliged to buy for price as well as for quality, we must feel that the inflow of these commodities is a real and dangerous attack upon American standards of living, upon American pay rolls, and upon American employment.

Under the continued impact of such condition, only one outcome can be certain, and that is that profits and wages must succumb to ferocious price slashing. And when that happens, it is not merely labor that suffers but the whole country as well from one end of it to the other, for if wages dwindle, purchasing power dwindles, trade languishes, and the disease of idleness and unemployment spreads. The ultimate sufferer is the Nation as a whole.

While plutocratic and military groups are fighting for the economic and political mastery of the Orient, let me cite the figures from the reports of the Japanese Government of the wages that are paid to the workers in Japanese industry. These figures show how remorselessly Japan can undersell

American mills and factories in the American market with imitation and counterfeit American goods.

The statistical reports of the Japanese Department of Commerce and Industry reveal that in the textile mills of Japan an average wage of 4½ cents an hour is paid, and in the rayon mills, 2½ cents an hour.

In the pottery industry, the wage is 6 cents an hour; for leather work, 39 cents a day; for carpenters, 60 cents a day; for male day labor, 43 cents a day, and for female day labor, 25 cents a day. The average wage is \$3.50 a week or less. In the textile industry, for instance, according to these reports of the Japanese Department of Commerce and Industry, Japanese weavers work at their looms for 80 hours a week and earn approximately \$2.04 a week. In the rush seasons they work about 100 hours a week and earn about \$3 in wages, or 3 cents an hour.

These figures apply to organized industries, where the workers are regularly employed. And yet they are not a true picture of the wage condition or wage rates in Japan, because they are typical of the higher-paid workers—the "cream of the jobs" in industry. Statistics as to the compensation in the lower strata of workers are not available in sufficient quantity to give a clear conception of this picture; there is indication that the Japanese Department of Commerce and Industry has not compiled statistics on these rates of pay that will convey an adequate conception of them.

Yet we know there are sweatshops in Japan, and while there is no official record of the earnings of the people who work in them, yet we know they are worse off and their earnings are infinitely lower than are the wages of those in the higher forms of industrial employment. Fortune magazine contends that one-third of the Japanese imports into the United States are produced in small family sweatshops, unregulated by factory laws and mercilessly underpaid.

We cannot be deluded by the contention that all of this is very far off, away across a huge ocean, and that for that reason it does not affect American employers and workers. Nor can we be influenced by the claim that the cost of living in Japan is much lower than it is in the United States. It is not the domestic prices that prevail in Japan or the costs of living for its working population that primarily concerns us as Americans; it is the prices for which the Japanese goods poured into America are offered for sale in competition with our own products.

What are we to do about it? What can we do about it?

First, we must demand official consideration and official cognizance of the conditions under which foreign goods are supplied to us and take the necessary steps to protect and safeguard our wage levels and volume of employment.

Second, we must watch for patent infringements, the counterfeiting of trade-marks, and those border-line cases of improper industrial practice and violation of business ethics where American goods are brazenly imitated. We should exert an effort to the end that trade-mark usage and declaration of country of origin rules shall be defined more fully to prevent deception and misbranding.

Third, we as Americans must be fully aware that patronage of such goods as are cheap imitations of our own products constitute an attack upon our standards of living, based on fair prices, high wages, and freedom of employment.

Fourth, our present tariff system should be used for protection against the practices which we condemn and special legislation enacted to fill the loopholes through which misbranded and unbranded commodities are leaking into our home markets.

Few in America realize that as ruinous as is Japanese competition today, it must become many times worse if Japan in its undeclared war upon China is successful and its boundless treasure house of raw materials is placed at the disposal of Japan's industrial lords for exploitation. Today Japan buys a large part of her raw materials abroad, including cotton from the United States, and in the competitive world markets. The problem of these markets will be solved if the

Japanese armies are successful in China. Japan and her overlords will then be free to launch upon a greater and more far-flung economic invasion of the United States than we as a people have heretofore believed possible.

In my opinion, it means that if Japan is successful in China, Japan will grow her own cotton in China and in time completely wipe out our foreign cotton market. I believe it is a tremendously serious problem for us all to face, and one which requires careful and immediate action. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BINDERUP] is recognized for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order heretofore entered, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BINDERUP] is recognized for 30 minutes.

GOVERNMENT MONETARY CONTROL

Mr. BINDERUP. Mr. Speaker, there is only one fountain from which all wealth comes. It is labor, combined with the natural resources of the earth. There are only three things that can cause unemployment:

First. If the natural resources that God gave to man should be exhausted.

Second. If labor should refuse to work.

Third. If government fails in equitable distribution.

We know, in the first place, that the natural resources, a gift from God, are inexhaustible. And yet they should not be wasted.

We know that labor is ever pleading that they may dip their hands deep into the fountain, the natural resources of the earth, and shape these into blessings for humanity.

But the third, equitable distribution of the Nation's wealth, that is where we fail.

I want to repeat, and I want to shout it from the mountaintop, that the Nation's Congress may know and read the handwriting on the wall, "that every nation that was and is no more died because the people failed to solve the problem of distribution"; that in the unequal fight of the toilers, who produce the Nation's wealth—and I mean mental as well as physical toil—I repeat, in this unequal fight against predatory, plundering, and selfish greed, the arch enemy of men and nations, civilization crumbles. For it is as true today as it was when Abraham Lincoln said, "A nation wherein the people are divided against themselves cannot live." Eventually one class dies of lust, luxury, leisure, and overindulgence, as a result of too great wealth, and the other class dies of misery and poverty because of unequitable distribution. Thus nations pass away with only a yellow page in history—a sad monument to a civilization that once was but is no more.

Mr. TRANSUE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BINDERUP. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. TRANSUE. I would like to have the gentleman explain at this time, if he will, how in his plan or his bill he proposes that this money is to be put in at the bottom.

Mr. BINDERUP. I thank the gentleman from Michigan. I shall be glad to do that at this time, as it is the most important feature of my bill—expansion of our money supply by creating a consuming and purchasing power among the lower-income group, the group that is at the bottom of our economic ladder. I wish further to explain how a continual income to the lower-income brackets of our Nation stimulates the entire structure of our economic life. I said that a social dividend to all needy old people over 60 years of age, to the widows, orphans, blind, and invalids, the Nation's honored needy, would add much more than \$5,000,000,000 to our national income and create a purchasing power that would

start our \$15,000,000,000 dormant bank deposits to become active, to circulate. I can best further explain this by taking just a few actual examples.

A certain old couple living in my district lost their nice little home to the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, a Government institution. They had brought up a fine family and had given their children a first-class education, but it left the old people with a little mortgage on their home. And when, in 1920, land and home values fell from \$66,000,000,000 to \$28,000,000,000, thus wiping out two-thirds of farm and home values, this by action of the Federal Reserve Banking System, hell's instrumentality of destruction when in the hands of international bankers. So these good people, like millions of others, became roaming nomads, without a home, patrons of W. P. A., subjects of charity. The old man came frequently to my office and visited the local bank, begging, sad, and humiliated, for a loan of only \$600 to buy a little old house on the outskirts of town. However, it was impossible to secure such a loan; but one day he got a letter from Washington that he and his wife had been allowed an old-age pension. It was only \$19 per month each; but, overjoyed by the contents of this letter, he came rushing into my office, showed me the letter, and said, "Now you will let me have the \$600, won't you? You see, we now have an income of \$38 monthly, and we can pay you \$25 per month out of this." And I said, of course, I would. Later in the day, however, he met me and said the banker wanted to let him have the money and he thought he should patronize the banker because really loaning money was the banker's business. So now we both wanted to let him have the money. Thus, because of a little insignificant \$19 per month pension to these old people we took out of the dormant deposits held in this little local bank \$600 and turned it into circulation. But we did much more than that; we created another home, another unit in the foundation of our Government. We took dependents from the W. P. A. rolls and we dried the tears on the cheeks of two of the greatest old people I have ever met. They tell me that these old people never forget; that they never eat a meal but what they first thank God for a government that gave them back a home.

I know of a very similar story of a tyrant, a corrupt monetary international-banker system, that steals from the people that which is justly theirs and piles it in the banks, issues a daily statement telling the people of all the money piled in the banks, and chains them with a corrupt monetary system just close enough so they can see and realize that it is just before them but just out of their reach, while they are suffering and dying for the want of that which is justly theirs, the Nation's circulating medium of exchange.

The Federal land bank was foreclosing the home and farm of Mr. and Mrs. Alfred Johnson. I had tried to secure a moratorium, an extension, or a new loan for them, but in vain. One day a Mr. and Mrs. Dover came to my office and told me they had been allowed an old-age pension of \$38 per month, and I suggested that they buy the house and 20 acres on the Alfred Johnson farm near town and in this way help the Johnsons save the remaining 140 acres of their farm. This they did, at a cost of \$2,000, borrowing it from the bank and agreeing to pay \$25 a month out of their pension, and giving a mortgage on the house and the 20 acres. So notice the magic of money when it comes as new money direct from the Government to the lower-income groups. With this \$38 a month pension we took these two old people off relief rolls, helped them secure a home, saved two others from losing their farm and being forced onto relief rolls, afforded two families homes, and built two more units in the foundation of our Government.

We put \$2,000 of idle, dormant bank deposits into circulation, satisfied the mortgage company, saved the expense and disgrace of foreclosure, increased the national income \$6,000, helped to reduce taxes by widening the tax base, helped to raise the price level of commodities and labor, and helped to strengthen democracy. Yes; we found the way—the only way; and all this because of a pension of only \$19 per month

to old people of over 65 years of age. Now imagine what we can do with a pension of \$50 to all old people over 60 years of age and with aid to widows, orphans, the blind, cripples, and invalids. I say we can scarcely estimate what this alone will do in the way of bringing back prosperity. Still one more example out of the millions. One old lady in my district took her old-age pension, went to the bank, and on the strength of it borrowed \$300, agreeing to pay \$10 monthly out of her pension, bought a little restaurant, took her son and family off relief and put them in the restaurant with her, and they are now making a living without a disgraceful dole.

But we will do more than this. I told you before that even if we raise our living standard only to the price level of 1926 and considering that Uncle Sam grows 4 percent a year, which is proved by 50 years' statistics, and knowing, if we know anything, that if Uncle Sam grows 4 percent he must have 4 percent more money added to the veins and arteries of his body or he cannot live. We are short of new money in the veins and arteries of trade and commerce to the extent of \$18,000,000,000 and we have \$15,000,000,000 demand-bank deposits which are dead, lying idle in the bank vaults. That means no less than \$33,000,000,000 short in our circulating medium of exchange, the wheels of trade and industry. Is it any wonder that we are starving to death in the midst of plenty and that we are forced back to the Dark Ages, to the exchange of our goods and services on the old barter system?

But I said my bill will do much more by expanding the money supply among the lower-income groups at the bottom of the ladder. This bill provides for \$1,000,000,000 every year for resettlement of farmers on their own farms. Under my bill, an amendment to the present Jones-Bankhead Act passed in the last session of Congress, it is provided that farmers, renters, farm hands, or anyone who can qualify under what we might term a civil-service examination, showing that they do understand farming, are eligible under this bill for Government financing up to the extent of \$8,000, repayment to be made on the amortization plan, 1½-percent interest and 1½-percent payment on principle each year. This not only puts an additional \$1,000,000,000 of new money into circulation yearly but it also—like the \$50 social dividends to people over 60 years—establishes a credit base whereon the bankers can lend their dormant money for horses, cattle, hogs, and machinery.

For example, I said to a banker in my district, "James Corbit is going to avail himself of the Jones-Bankhead Act and will get a certain 80 acres of land, equipped with an irrigation well, a little tar-paper shack for a home, and a baled straw barn. How much money would you let Jim have?" The banker took it under consideration and later stated that he would let Jim have \$3,000, taking a mortgage on stock and machinery at 6-percent interest. The potential possibilities of this would show that we could put \$1,000,000,000 new money into circulation yearly which would establish at least 125,000 farms. Supposing each of these farmers would take the above-mentioned loan of \$3,000 from his banker, it would release no less than \$375,000,000 of dormant bank deposits yearly. We believe, however, it will be possible to establish twice as many farms without exceeding the price level of 1926, and that we will create by the Jones-Bankhead Act and this monetary control bill, 250,000 farms with \$2,000,000,000 of new money in circulation each year for at least several years. It is only in an effort to be safe that we suggest \$1,000,000,000 and 125,000 farms.

It must be remembered that a price level will not start to raise until demand exceeds capacity to produce. As factories and farms can produce much cheaper at full capacity than when operated at only part capacity, there will be complete employment long before we reach our full capacity to produce, so definitely it will be a shortage of labor that will raise the price level as labor will be exhausted long before the natural resources of the earth are exhausted.

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BINDERUP. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HILL. Why does not selling bonds as we are now doing put money into circulation, using the money or bank credit to check on? I do not believe the gentleman from Nebraska has made this quite clear.

Mr. BINDERUP. I thank the gentleman for calling attention to this important matter. Selling bonds to the big banks and checking on the credit of these banks, which, of course, is all we do, we never get a cent of money—currency—from the banks, simply credit on the books, merely a bookkeeping transaction; I say selling bonds to these bankers merely puts money into circulation for a few months, probably 3 months, and by that time the big banks have sold these same bonds we are checking on, to the people or to the small commercial banks in the rural districts, so they take out of circulation the same amount of money we put into circulation. This plan is most illogical; it is the endless circle that gets us nowhere in the way of recovery, only further in the mire when we should be expanding our money supply in new money, over a billion and a half yearly in order to keep up with the physical growth of Uncle Sam.

It reminds me of a story of the kids asking, "Say, Johnnie, why do you take castor oil?" and Johnnie said, "Because my mother gives me a nickel every day to take it." The kids: "What do you do with your nickels?" Johnnie: "I put them in my bank." And the kids asked, "But when your bank is full what do you do?" and Johnnie replied, "Then mother opens the bank, takes the money, and buys more castor oil."

Now, compare this ridiculous, foolish plan with the plan provided for in my bill. First, my bill puts into circulation directly, through social dividends, \$1,602,000,000 yearly, in new money, with the establishing of a credit base which can be used by the banks for lending dormant bank deposits. As I said, 3,339,000 needy old people, widows, orphans, cripples, the blind, and invalids, estimating their average age at 65 years, would have an expectancy or would live exactly 12 years on an average; thus 3,339,000 recipients of \$50 per month for 12 years equals \$20,000,000,000, a lasting base of credit.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nebraska may have 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEAVY. I want to ask this further question of the gentleman from Nebraska. The gentleman said the banks cannot circulate other than their demand deposits which are secured 100 percent.

Mr. BINDERUP. In my bill the deposits of a bank are definitely divided as between demand deposits and time deposits. As to demand deposits, the banker becomes merely custodian for the depositor, charging him for services in taking care of his checking account. As to time deposits, it is different. Here he becomes a broker for his time depositors, lending their money for them, making a commission from the difference in the interest paid the depositor and the interest charged the borrower.

Mr. LEAVY. So, if the banker lends that money which represents accumulated savings, has he not utilized the accumulated savings to expand the circulating medium?

Mr. BINDERUP. Yes; but that would allow the exact amount of our money supply to remain in circulation even though it is deposited in the banks, as the banks would immediately loan their time deposits into circulation. But we must do more than this, we must increase our money supply daily, and my bill provides that we increase our volume of money no less than \$8,000,000 a day besides increasing the velocity of money. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Dean Andrews, of the Syracuse University Law School, and an editorial of comment thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

USE OF RELIEF FUNDS FOR PARTISAN POLITICAL PURPOSES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. LORD] for 15 minutes.

Mr. LORD. Mr. Speaker, I reserved this time that I might call attention to a letter from Judge Brady M. Stewart, of Louisville, Ky., who is the manager of Governor Chandler's campaign for nomination for the Senate of the United States. I intended to ask permission to extend this letter in the RECORD, but I notice that on page 2144 of the Appendix of the RECORD my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. BACON] has extended the letter, so those who want to refer to it may do so at that point in the RECORD.

I shall refer to a few brief lines in this letter. I direct attention—and I quote—to the—

Willful misuse of certain Federal functions in this Commonwealth.

I quote:

It has become common talk among our people that the State administrator of the Works Progress Administration in Kentucky has openly and boldly stated that he and his organization will leave nothing undone to achieve the reelection of Senator BARKLEY; and, accordingly, every Federal relief agency in Kentucky is frankly and brazenly operating upon a political basis. For the first time in our observation, the Works Progress Administration, which was conceived and established to feed the families of the unemployed, irrespective of the politics, race, or creed of those to be served through its directing heads, is seeking to drive hungry and destitute people to vote for a certain candidate for office. Meetings and conferences have been held in practically every county of the State by keymen in places of importance with the Works Progress Administration, at which definite instructions were given to selected agents that no one should be placed on Federal relief except upon the advice of Senator BARKLEY's campaign managers in the respective counties. Furthermore, these same agents have been required to inform all those individuals who seek Federal assistance that, unless they are for the candidate for Senator whom the heads of the relief administration are supporting, there will be neither relief funds nor jobs for them.

Mr. Speaker, this is something we never thought could transpire in these United States. The taxpayers' money is being used to put forward some candidate for office in this country; someone who is supposed to represent the people in this Congress. I refer to Kentucky, also Florida and Iowa, where the taxpayers' money is, according to this letter, being used for votes and the poor, needy people going hungry.

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LORD. Yes.

Mr. CULKIN. Does the gentleman remember that this was the way that the ancient Republic of Rome fell? It was through the dictators' use of the money of the people for bread and circuses.

Mr. LORD. I think the gentleman is quite right. That is the way Rome fell.

Mr. CULKIN. And history may repeat itself in this country.

Mr. LORD. History apparently is repeating itself; and this boring from within and wasting the taxpayers' money will surely ruin our Nation if not stopped.

I call attention to another quotation from the letter:

Republicans who have been certified for relief work in an impartial manner, and have worked for some time as Federal employees, have been instructed by agents of the Works Progress Administration to change their registration and vote for Senator BARKLEY, on penalty of being released therefrom in case of refusal.

This we call free America.

We saw in the paper a few days ago that Harry Hopkins said that any W. P. A. worker who engaged in politics in their respective districts and States would be immediately released from office. In fact, he went so far in Pennsylvania as to release them, according to newspaper articles. However, I am

informed now—and I think reliably—that those relieved from office happen to be Republicans. This is all entirely out of politics—or is it? I again quote:

Instructions have gone out from the head of the Works Progress Administration in Kentucky that all records pertaining to employment and salaries must be kept confidential and secret.

I wonder why it is necessary to keep them confidential and secret. Of course, during the primary campaign in Florida for United States Senator, to which I have referred before, it is said—and it has never been denied—that everyone was put on the pay roll that would vote the right way. This is another such instance, I assume.

The favored one, of course, was nominated for office down in Florida, but it was a matter of using the taxpayers' money to carry out the political wishes of the administration. Now, in Iowa Mr. Hopkins, of whom I have always held in high regard, has in a rather undercover way told the W. P. A. worker how to vote.

Mr. Hopkins in a recent address over the radio emphatically declared that no person receiving Federal relief would lose his job for voting as he saw fit. That is like it was up in New England in the early days when people came to this country to establish a place where everyone could worship God as he saw fit; but if they did not worship God according to the dictates of those in power, they were called witches and their ears were cut off or their tongues were cut out. So it is in this instance; they can vote as they see fit so long as they vote the way the W. P. A. dictates. This was discussed at some length in the Senate yesterday, Mr. Chairman, and I do not need to go into detail. It was brought up by the majority side, by the administration side, in the Senate, and I was in hopes that it would be by the majority side in the House. I dislike to bring it to the attention of the House, but I know that many of those on the New Deal side, while desirous of bringing it up, rather hesitate to do so, and I am doing so more on account of taking their part in this campaign, taking the side that it should be brought out. They do not want to bring it to the attention of the country for fear of what will happen to them, for it will be just another case where they will not be on the side of the heaviest artillery (\$ \$ \$). It will be just too bad for them. So I hope that the real Democrats in this Congress on this side of the House will wake up and come to the rescue of the Nation in this time of stress as Senator WHEELER, Senator BURKE, and others of the Democratic Party have in the Senate, and not leave it for the Republicans to call the attention of the taxpayers to the brazen way the New Dealers are spending their money.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a radio address delivered by myself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. CURLEY, indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. DALY, indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. GRAY of Indiana, for today, on account of official business.

To Mr. WOODRUFF (at the request of Mr. MAPES), indefinitely, on account of illness.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1225. An act to provide for insanity proceedings in the District of Columbia.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 27, 1938, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Friday, May 27, 1938. Business to be considered: Hearing on H. R. 10127, railroad unemployment insurance.

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Tuesday, May 31, 1938. Business to be considered: Hearings on H. R. 10620 entitled "To remove existing reductions in compensation for transportation of Government property and troops incident to railroad land grants."

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

There will be a hearing before the Special Subcommittee on Bankruptcy of the Committee on the Judiciary at 10 a. m. on Wednesday, June 1, 1938, on H. R. 10387, to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, and for other purposes (sec. 77), (relative to railroad reorganization). The hearing will be held in the Judiciary Committee room, 346 House Office Building.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1385. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 17, 1938, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a reexamination of Missouri River, from Kansas City, Mo., to Sioux City, Iowa, with view to determining if waterworks improvements at Leavenworth, Kans., have been damaged by navigation improvements, the extent of such damages, and advisability of remedial action, requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted March 25, 1938; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1386. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 18, 1938, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a reexamination of Sabine-Neches Waterway, Tex., requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted April 14, 1938; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1387. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 18, 1938, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Goldsborough Creek, Wash., authorized by the Flood Control Act, approved June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Flood Control.

1388. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 18, 1938, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Ottawa River, Ohio, authorized by the River and Harbor Act, approved August 26, 1937; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1389. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting the draft of a bill to extend the benefits of the United States Employees' Compensation Act to members of the Officers' Reserve Corps and of the Enlisted Reserve Corps of the Army, who are physically injured in the line of duty while performing active duty or engaged in authorized training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. SMITH of Connecticut: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 10725. A bill to amend the act entitled "An

act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2478). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. EDMISTON: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 1694. An act authorizing the Secretary of War to convey to the town of Montgomery, W. Va., a certain tract of land; without amendment (Rept. No. 2485). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SIROVICH: Committee on Patents. House Joint Resolution 671. Joint resolution to create a Bureau of Fine Arts in the Department of the Interior for the promotion of art and literature through the use of copyrighted and copy-rightable material and to define the powers and duties of said Bureau, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2486). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 10567. A bill to authorize appropriations for construction and rehabilitation at military posts, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2487). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PATTON: Committee on the Territories. H. R. 7844. A bill to amend the act of Congress entitled "An act to establish an Alaska Game Commission to protect game animals, land fur-bearing animals, and birds in Alaska, and for other purposes," approved January 13, 1925, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 2488). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KELLER: Committee on the Library. H. R. 10217. A bill to provide for the competitive selection, subject to the approval of Congress, of the design for the Thomas Jefferson Memorial; with amendment (Rept. No. 2489). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BLOOM: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 9933. A bill to authorize the United States Golden Gate International Exposition Commission to produce and sell certain articles, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2490). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BLOOM: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Joint Resolution 688. Joint resolution creating the Niagara Falls Bridge Commission and authorizing said commission and its successors to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Niagara River at or near the city of Niagara Falls, N. Y.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2491). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 7693. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to transfer to the Government of Puerto Rico certain real estate of the War Department; with amendment (Rept. No. 2492). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 10455. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to proceed with the construction of certain public works in connection with the War Department in the District of Columbia; with amendment (Rept. No. 2493). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 9014. A bill to authorize the conveyance to the Lane S. Anderson Post, No. 297, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, of the house and site at Lock No. 6, Kanawha River, South Charleston, W. Va.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2495). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Committee on Foreign Affairs. S. 3104. An act for the payment of awards and appraisals heretofore made in favor of citizens of the United States on claims presented under the General Claims Convention of September 8, 1923, United States and Mexico; without amendment (Rept. No. 2496). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SHANLEY: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 10687. A bill to authorize the President to permit citizens of the American Republics to receive instruction at professional educational institutions and schools maintained and

administered by the Government of the United States or by Departments or agencies thereof; without amendment (Rept. No. 2497). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII.

Mr. SPARKMAN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 5604. A bill for the relief of William Kelley; without amendment (Rept. No. 2479). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FADDIS: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 652. An act for the relief of John B. Jones; without amendment (Rept. No. 2480). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HARTE: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 1239. An act for the relief of John W. Beck; without amendment (Rept. No. 2481). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HARTE: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 2883. An act for the relief of George H. Lowe, Jr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2482). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FADDIS: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 3490. An act for the relief of Benjamin H. Faith; without amendment (Rept. No. 2483). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 3917. An act authorizing the President to present gold medals to Mrs. Robert Aldrich and posthumously to Anna Boulogny; with amendment (Rept. No. 2484). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TURNER: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 656. A bill for the relief of Elmer W. Haas; without amendment (Rept. No. 2494). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HARTE: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 8799. A bill to provide for the reinstatement of First Lt. William B. Blaufuss, United States Army, retired, to the active list of the Regular Army as a first lieutenant; with amendment (Rept. No. 2498). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RAMSPECK: A bill (H. R. 10763) to amend section 6 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. KING: A bill (H. R. 10764) to amend section 73 of the Hawaiian Organic Act approved April 30, 1900, as amended; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. PATRICK: A bill (H. R. 10765) authorizing the establishment and maintenance by the War Department of a harbor and channel at Orange Beach, Ala., and providing for the lighting and dredging thereof; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HAVENNER: A bill (H. R. 10766) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to establish a retirement system for employees of carriers subject to the Interstate Commerce Act, and for other purposes,' approved August 20, 1935," approved June 24, 1937; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'CONNOR of New York: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 699) to amend sections 101, 102, 103, and 104 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to congressional investigations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TREADWAY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 700) establishing a Federal Tax Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BERNARD: A bill (H. R. 10767) for the relief of Edwin J. Sasser; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAMILTON: A bill (H. R. 10768) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of the persons named in this act for overtime service in the Norfolk (Va.) Navy Yard, Portsmouth, Va., between the years 1878 and 1882; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KEOGH: A bill (H. R. 10769) for the relief of Thomas F. Kenney; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SNYDER of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 10770) granting a pension to John William Marshall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOOD: A bill (H. R. 10771) granting a pension to Royster Alexander White; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5239. By Mr. KENNEDY of New York: Petition of the National Congress of Parents and Teachers at Washington, D. C., urging support of Neely-Pettengill bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5240. Also, petition of the Equitable-Mutual Homestead Association of New Orleans, La., urging adoption of House bill No. 10112, presented by Congressman J. O. FERNANDEZ, of Louisiana; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5241. Also, petition of the Roland German-American Democratic Society of Greater New York, Inc., urging enactment of the Celler bill (H. R. 10013); to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

5242. By Mr. LEAVY: Resolution of the Okanogan County Pomona Grange, No. 53, of Okanogan County, Wash., pointing out the need of a greater circulating medium and condemning the private issue and control of money and urging upon Congress the enactment of legislation that will restore to Congress the constitutional right to coin money and regulate the value thereof and establish a system of circulation which will take care of the needs of the Nation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5243. Also, resolution of Okanogan County Pomona Grange, No. 53, Okanogan County, Wash., relative to the establishment of a byproduct experiment station as provided for in the Bankhead-Jones Act of 1938 and requesting that one such laboratory and experiment station be established in the northwestern part of the United States at Pullman, Wash., where the State College of Washington is located; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5244. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Peace Officers Association of Los Angeles County, Los Angeles, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution dated May 11, 1938, with reference to funds for the Federal Bureau of Investigation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5245. Also, petition of the State Democratic Executive Committee, Columbia, S. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Federal Farm Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5246. Also, petition of the Industrial Commission of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah, petitioning consideration of their resolution dated May 17, 1938, with reference to the Social Security Board; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MAY 27, 1938

(Legislative day of Wednesday, April 20, 1938)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, May 26, 1938, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.